







# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

---

VOL. XXXIV.—JULY, 1909—No. 135.

---

## FIFTY YEARS OF ITALIAN UNITY.

ON THE 24th of November, 1848, the Sovereign Pontiff, Pope Pius IX., was advised by the French Minister, the Duc de Harcourt, and Bavarian Minister, Count Von Spaur, that it was essential to his personal safety that he should leave Rome and seek some secure place outside where the business of the Church might be carried on without molestation. This event was regarded as the triumph of the Italian revolution by the fall of Rome, and the consummation of the long protracted struggle for Italian "unity." That was the euphemism invented to describe the spoliation of the Papacy and the Church and the forcible wresting of the civil crown from the Papal tiara. But the "unification" did not take place until 1859—after the defeat of Austria by France and Italy. This year the Italians of the Revolutionary party propose to celebrate the event with imposing manifestations in the principal cities and villages throughout the peninsula. Of course, the chief celebration will be that which will be held in the ancient capital of the Papacy, and the triumphant radicals will take as much pains to gloat over the plight of the now helpless Pope, a prisoner in the hands of his enemies, as a band of red Indians dancing around the stake where their victim is fastened to undergo the torture and the fire that is to complete the feast.

It is fitting that a revolution which began with an act of assassination be celebrated by men who believe that assassination is patriotism and private robbery a public service. No fouler crime was ever perpetrated than the murder of Count Rossi, no baser act of ingrati-



tude than the requital of Pius IX.'s too liberal concessions to popular demands by the defeat of the measures he had taken to inaugurate a *régime* of progress and popular share in the civil government of Rome and the Papal States by the displacements of his Ministers and the filling of his palace with hidden enemies sworn to bury their knives in his body in the same way they had fleshed them in that of his distinguished Minister.

There are thousands of excellent and well-meaning men and women who regard the process employed in the "unification" of the Italian peninsula under the crown of Piedmont and Sardinia as a secondary consideration, so long as the unification itself was accomplished. Such a philosophy is pernicious. The moral element is the first consideration in all movements aiming for the social improvement of the masses. But, even if this were not the case, there still would be the question whether a revolution initiated by foul crimes was justified by the results secured, in the amelioration of the people's condition and their moral and material well-being. We have no proof that such a doubtful justification has been afforded in the case of "united Italy." We have, on the contrary, proof that the reverse has been the case. The people of Italy were never so ground down under a system of cruel taxation as they are under the present rule. A fearful "blood tax" has been imposed upon them by reason of the entry of the Italian Government into the Triple Alliance—a measure necessitated by the danger that a reversal of the events of 1870 would be effected when any new arrangement of the map of Europe would result from the defeat of one of the Great Powers in war, as in the case of the cession of Nice and Savoy to France, and the cession by her, in turn, of Alsace and Lorraine to Germany at the end of the war which ended the Second Empire.

We said in a former article that it was highly probable that the time is not far off when the chaotic condition of morals and politics in Europe would demand, as it previously did demand, after the overthrow of Napoleon at Waterloo, that the Papacy be restored to its old place in the moral economy. What is going on to-day in every civilized country leads irresistibly to that conclusion. The world is tossing about like a ship that has lost its rudder, or as our globe must do in space were some enormous internal convulsion to cause a shifting of her centre of gravity.

A brief review of the chief events which preceded the process of unification may not be out of order. In the first place, the employment of the word "unification" was an afterthought. It was not in the minds of the conspirators who began the revolutionary movement in various parts of Italy in 1848. It had its birth, it would appear, in the dark and secretive brain of Cavour, and took form when that



statesman induced the King of Sardinia to throw in his handful of an army along with the hosts of Britain, France and Turkey, against the Russian advance, in 1854. This astute step secured the help of Britain when the hour should strike for allowing the conspiracy of Mazzini and Garibaldi to come to an open head. The great French statesman, Guizot, clearly saw what was going on below the surface, and gave the ambitious design its proper title. He preferred, he said, an Italian Confederation to a "Piedmontese domination under the name of Italian unity." Guizot was a Protestant, and yet no Catholic spoke out more fearlessly than he against the hypocritical policy of Cavour and the House of Savoy in fomenting trouble in the Papal States in order to find a pretext for invading the territory to "preserve order." "In order to attain its ends," he wrote in his remarkable book entitled "*L'Eglise et La Societé Chrétiennes en 1861*," "Piedmont is obliged to trample under foot the rights of nations in despoiling the Pope of the estates of which he is sovereign, just as it tramples under foot the rights of religious liberty in overturning the constitution of the Catholic Church, of which the Pope is the head. Such necessities are the condemnation of the policy which imposes them." The author was here referring to restrictions of the liberty of the Church within Piedmontese territory, placed on it designedly by the policy of Cavour as a means to an end—the end being to provoke a conflict with the Pope's authority, to be followed up by an act of aggression on the Papal territory. This was the policy pursued in the face of Europe persistently from 1848 until the withdrawal of the French troops in 1870. Then the mask was flung aside, and the perfidious tactics of Cavour and Ratazzi were crowned by the outrageous attack on Rome itself and the onrush of the Garibaldian rabble and the "reduci," to indulge in a riot of murder and robbery in the defenseless streets of the Pope's capital.

All the moral influence of England was put forth in support of this policy of Piedmontese aggression. Cavour was in constant communication with Lord Palmerston. The British press was filled with the most rancorous denunciations of the Papal Government, day after day, week after week. The *Times* openly preached revolution by the dagger—the very doctrine of Mazzini. "Liberty," it said, "was to be fought for by the hatchet and the knife." A member of the Tory Cabinet, Mr. Stansfeld, the Postmaster General, openly avowed his friendship for Mazzini at a public banquet, and approved his revolutionary methods—that is to say, the methods of the assassin; the method employed by James Carey and "No. 1" in the case of the attack on two British officials in the Phoenix Park, outside Dublin, in May, 1882. In that case seven men were hanged



for following the counsel given by the *Times* as to modes in which the battle of liberty should be fought. Those ideas of the *Times* lost nothing in ferocity in the transference into Italian literature which immediately followed their appearance. Guarrazzi, one of the foremost agitators, who was also a novel writer of the new Romantic school, embodied some of them in his romance called "The Siege of Florence." In the preface he wrote:

"I thought it charity to ply all the torments used by the ancient tyrants and by the Holy Office, and to invent others still more atrocious, to excite the sensibility of this land, fallen into miserable lethargy; I wounded it, and poured into the wounds brimstone and burning pitch; I galvanized it, and God only knows the trembling anxiety with which I saw it open its closed eyes and move its livid lips. I chose the part of Prometheus, and wished to animate the statue, even though the vulture shall prey upon my vitals forever."

To the efforts of the novelists to inflame the popular mind to the boiling point were added the harangues of the firebrand orators. Some recreant priests were foremost in this unpriestly work—men like Alessandro Gavazzi, who had no control of either tongue or passion. It was little wonder that the peninsula was soon in such a condition as Cavour and Mazzini desired for the realization of their dreams and their ambitions. Although these two leaders of the whirlwind created and utilized similar agencies in their respective plans, they worked for entirely different ends. Cavour aimed at placing his puppet, Victor Emmanuel, at the head of a single Italian monarchy; Mazzini's grand dream was a triumphant Republic, a reproduction of the ancient classic commonwealth in modern Rome.

Pius IX. had demonstrated that while outside opinion on Italian affairs demanded reform, Cavour and Mazzini worked for other ends. He had given the Romans reform till their applause of his liberality became too vociferous and continuous, and he had to request a cessation. He gave them a constitution; he released men who had been confined in prison for political offenses, and they immediately began to utilize their freedom in the formation of fresh conspiracies against their liberator. Mazzini had for his chief lieutenant in Rome an ambitious and eloquent demagogue named Angelo Brunetti, who, by reason of his oratorical gifts, was popularly known as Ciceruacchio—the second Cicero. This man, by his lavish generosity as well as his enthusiastic sympathy with the popular cause, had obtained a power to sway the multitude as great as that of Cola da Rienzo, "the last of the Tribunes." This power he sedulously utilized for the purpose of carrying out the plans of the revolutionary party, as directed from Paris and London by Giuseppe Mazzini. A game worthy of the sinister genius of



Machiavelli was played, under orders from that arch-revolutionist. The people were to be schooled to applaud every act of concession on the part of the new Pope and his Prime Minister, the popular Cardinal Gizzi, but to resume soon their clamors for fresh concessions, until they had secured control of all the machinery of government as well as the Civic Guard of Rome and the National Guard of the provinces, and eventually got the Pope himself practically a prisoner in his own city and his very palace.

By a "Motu Proprio" of October, 1847, the Holy Father had established a Council of State, consisting of representatives of the people and members of his own Council, to frame laws for the municipality and the administration of the governmental departments. This important concession only made the hungry revolutionists all the more exorbitant in their demands. Events outside had been such as to accelerate the revolutionary programme of the Mazzinians. The occupation of Ferrara by the Austrians, adopted as a measure of precaution against incendiary attacks, aroused the revolutionists to fury. Insurrections broke out in succession in Milan, Palermo and Naples. The Royal forces were driven out of Sicily; the Grand Dukes of Tuscany and Modena were soon driven out, and it was seen clearly enough that Rome would be the next objective of the revolutionary forces. The expulsion of Louis Philippe from France, followed by the proclamation of a new Republic, seemed to have applied the torch to all the inflammable material of Europe. In this alarming crisis the Pope's advisers counselled fresh measures of conciliation, and the advice was speedily acted on. A new and much more liberal Constitution was drawn up by the celebrated jurist and theologian, Father Perrone. But the "party of action" wanted more than a Constitution: they wanted a Republic with a Pope at its head, or else a prisoner at their mercy. The King of Sardinia, Charles Albert, threw his sword now into the scale. As an offset to the Austrian move on Ferrara, he invaded Venice with a large army, and the popular enthusiasm for a war with Austria whirled even the Pope's advisers along with the stream. A great meeting held in the Colosseum demanded that the Pope's army should join in the march on Venice, and General Durando, the Papal commander-in-chief, was instructed to go so far as to lead the troops to the frontier, but on no account to cross into Austrian territory or to commit any hostile act. These orders he rashly violated as soon as he was on the scene of action, and so the Pope was, against his will, committed to a war on a power that had long been a steadfast friend of the Papacy.

The war ended most disastrously for the Sardinian Kingdom. At Custoza its armies were swept away and its fleet at Lissa; and



popular indignation was so great that Charles Albert was forced to make another effort at Novarra. He was again defeated and was forced to abdicate in favor of his son, Victor Emmanuel II. His first work was to sue for peace with the victorious Austrians. These exciting events coincided with a recrudescence of disorders in Rome, owing to the rapid increase of the revolutionary spirit and the insolence of a party intoxicated with the success of demagogic aggression. When the news of the defeat and downfall of the King reached Rome, the House of Deputies voted a conscription of 12,000 men to aid the Italian army, the enrollment of a Foreign Legion and an assessment of 400,000 dollars on the city of Rome. The Holy Father at once refused to sanction these measures. He clearly foresaw that a continuance of war against Austria meant the ruin of Rome and Italy. His refusal brought about the resignation of Signor Mamiani, the President. He was succeeded in office by Count Fabbri, a wise and moderate progressist, but his great age rendered his fulfillment of the arduous duties of the office too difficult a task; and after a short time the Pope sent for Count Pellegrino Rossi to take charge of the Ministerial portfolio.

Count Rossi bore a very high reputation as a diplomatist and a statesman. He was an Italian born, and sympathized with the aspirations of the greater minds of Italy for a larger national life. He had served France for many years as its representative at the Papal Court, but when the revolution overturned the rule of Louis Philippe he lost his place. He was greatly esteemed by Pope Pius IX. and often consulted by him on matters of moment as between Church and State and the ever-increasing demands of the malcontents. The seals of office he accepted with much reluctance, but once he took them he determined to apply himself to the task of perfecting a system of good government as a high patriotic and Christian duty. His first work was to reorganize all the civil departments of the Papal Government. He was assisted in this by four lay members of the Council of State, whose integrity and ability were well known, as well as by two ecclesiastical ones no less conspicuous for fitness for office—Cardinals Soglio and Vizzarelli. Friends of law and order flocked to his side, and he had liberal offers of monetary help to bring about a restoration of public confidence as the first essential to the commercial welfare in Rome and the provinces. Count Rossi's next act proved him to be a statesman fit to cope with any problem that might present itself in the high task of ruling a State. He projected an Italian Confederacy, in accordance with the views of the Pope and M. Guizot, as well as other thoughtful statesman, with the Pope as Honorary President. This Confederacy was designed for the purpose of securing each



independent Italian State against outside aggression—like the ancient Achæan League, the Hanseatic League, the Confederation of the Rhine, and similar defensive alliances. To bring this idea to a practical phase Count Rossi opened negotiations with the Governments of Naples, Florence and Turin. The design did not by any means accord with the ambitions of the House of Savoy, and when it was broached steps were taken, secretly and openly, to prevent its ever bearing practical fruit. Meanwhile Count Rossi took measures to repress the rabies of revolutionary firebrands in the capital. He had Gavazzi arrested and jailed for preaching rebellion, and took steps to moderate the ardor of the revolutionary editors in Rome as well as bring about quiet and security in the streets of Rome, by night as well as by day. The revolutionists perceived immediately that a firm hand was now grasping the tiller, and, as this was the last condition they regarded as likely to arise, they determined to make that hand firmer—in the rigidity of death. It were illogical had they resolved otherwise. To such a culmination had all the lessons they had been sedulously taught for the previous half century progressively led up. They took their measures carefully, so that there might be no hitch in the working out of the programme.

We would here desire to pause for a moment to survey the Janus-like character of the propaganda which brought about the tragedy of the Roman Revolution. One of the excuses put forward for Piedmontese intermeddling in the affairs of the Papal States was that "the Pope had ceased to govern." The same equivocation was used fifty years before 1848 by Napoleon and his instruments, after they made it hard, by means of French invasion and consequent anarchy, for the Pope to govern. The cry, "the Pope is incapable of governing" was set up before the Pope showed by his action that he was quite capable and willing to govern—to govern *aright*, if left alone. But this was not what these apologists for robbery and murder wanted. They wanted power as Macbeth and Richard the Third wanted it—for the sake of power and the worldly things it brings to people in politics. The movement against the Temporal Power of the Papacy originated, insisted the *North British Review* and other English and Scottish mouthpieces of anti-Catholic spleen, *within the Papacy*. And yet the same wall-eyed organs proceeded to defend in grandiloquent terms the long planned, organized, relentless, unscrupulous conspiracy against the Papacy, gotten up by Mazzini and Garibaldi, secretly fomented and aided by Cavour and the Piedmontese Government. It was granted by the *North British Review*—we write with a copy before us—to be a movement "marked throughout by that logic *which stifles justice and reason*"



(the italics are ours) ; and "it designed the destruction of the Papacy because it was opposed to its ideal schemes." There never was an example of cynical contempt of consistency in argument so gross as the British howl against the Papacy: first charging it with impotency to wield the sceptre of power, and then with deserving the dagger of the assassin when it put forth the hand of the policeman to seize and lock up the villains and cut-throats whom it found endeavoring to frustrate its efforts to maintain order and promote prosperity. And to add to the recklessness of this cynicism, there was not even a pretense of concealment of its object. The *North British Review*, already referred to, openly avowed that its purpose, in printing the furious outbursts of such writers as Azeglio, was to excite the horror and indignation of the outside world against the Papal Government. Mrs. Elizabeth Barrett Browning was the poetical pythoness of that campaign of blind hatred and jaundiced bigotry. Her poems, "Casa Guidi Windows," reeked with open incitements to revolt and assassination, alternated with ribald derision of the Papacy, such as this:

Peter, Peter! he does not speak;  
 He is not as rash as in old Galilee:  
 Safer a ship, though it toss and leak,  
 Than a reeling foot on a rolling sea!  
 And he's got to be round in the girth, thinks he.

Peter, Peter, thou fisher of men,  
 Fisher of fish wouldst thou live instead?  
 Hagglng for peace with the other Ten,  
 Cheating the market at so much a head,  
 Gripping the bag of the traitor dead

The gentle lady did not hesitate to encourage even the Atheist to rise up and murder, with the hope of ultimate pardon, should he fall in the attempt, from that Deity whom he spurned as the imposture of crafty priests, by such hortations as the following lines, culled from the "Last Poems and Other Works of Mrs. Browning:"

Peace, you say—yes, peace in truth:  
 But such a peace as the ear can achieve  
 'Twixt the rifle's click and the rush of the ball,  
 'Twixt the tiger's spring and the crunch of the tooth,  
 'Twixt the dying Atheist's negative  
 And God's face—waiting after all!

It were easy to imagine the effect of such an incitement and such an encouragement on the mind of an Irish Attorney General like Whiteside, and an Irish Judge like Keogh, had the poem been written by one of the Fenian leaders and published in an Irish organ, at a time of political ferment. The English language would be too poor to give utterance to their feelings of horror at the impiety.

The remarkable fact about the encouragement given by English politicians and poets to the revolutionary movement in Italy was their obtuseness to the parallel that existed between the case of



Ireland under British rule and the case of Italians under Austrian rule. We see no such parallel in the case of Italians under Papal rule: it was government of Italians by Italians, and for the benefit of Italians. It may have been bad government in some respects, in so far as its operation and results were concerned, at times; but it was not out of hatred for the people that it was bad, nor out of any desire but for their welfare; there was no other government animated by love for the people and solicitude for their wellbeing as the Papal Government was. But the oppression of Ireland by the British Government had its source in the malice of the oppressor, who never can forgive the enemy whom he wrongs and has wronged. All the infamy attributed to the Austrian system of repression was characteristic of the British system in Ireland, in regard to the detection and repression of revolutionary designs. Espionage, employment and encouragement of informers, holding out of rewards for those who would betray comrades in political enterprises, suspensions of constitutional procedure and trial by special commissions of Judges appointed by the Crown; arrest and imprisonment on suspicion; barbarous treatment of prisoners; impoverishment of the people by exorbitant and illegal taxation; frightful punishment by "transportation" on convict ships of those accused of "treason-felony"—a newly-invented crime, by means of which the patriot was degraded to the level of the murderer and the cutpurse or burglar. All this oppression, worse than Egyptian over Israelites in many respects, was carried on under a government with a headship that differed from the Papacy, in its claims in spirituals and temporals, only in degree and absence of divine sanction. Britain's sovereign was the head of Britain's Church, and made and unmade Bishops and prebends without the help of Cardinals, but only on the word of a Prime Minister! The English Protestant Church, planted by force and fraud upon the Catholic soil of Ireland, maintained itself by the forcible extortion of tithes from the Catholic tillers of the soil, often at the cost of human life and barbarous scenes of bloodshed. The peasantry had been driven from their homes, to fly across the ocean, by tens and hundreds of thousands, to escape death by famine, by a system of barbarous land laws, introduced by England, in substitution for their native laws, which gave the peasant as much right in the soil, proportionately, as the chief. The only British poet or prosist who dared British opprobrium by lifting up voice or pen on behalf of the miserable Irish victims of that Philistine barbarity were the Rev. Sydney Smith and Lord Byron.

There was hardly an attempt to disguise the real motive that underlay the propaganda in England. Sympathy with the Italian



patriots was the fine flower of hatred of Popery and the Papacy. We have mentioned the name of Whiteside. He was a lawyer who subsequently became a Judge, and one of those whose writings and speeches breathed the True Blue spirit in every passage. He contributed not a little to the venom of the pro-Italian propaganda. A book of his on Italy reached at least five editions. It was crammed with stories copied after the style of the Decameron; and even so rabid an anti-Papal magazine as the *North British Review* did not hesitate to tell the author that it strongly suspected that he knew that some of the tales were no more authentic than the old fables called "The Seven Champions of Christendom." Italian writers like Zobi, Azeglio, Gualterio, Guerrazzi, Farini and others of the inventive tribe, filled the public ear, at the same period, with tales of the immorality of the clergy and sisters in Italy, linking this somehow with the misgovernment of the political rulers—just as some of our own writers sought to do a few years ago with regard to the religious orders in the Philippines. The cry was raised in England that the Pope had banned the Bible, and an army of Bible-readers (as the proselytizers were popularly called in Ireland, where they had previously been employed to buy the faith of the starving peasantry with gold from Exeter Hall) was let loose on the Italian peninsula, to ply their insidious arts in the cities outside Rome. It was boasted in the English press that the principles of Protestantism had spread over almost every town in Tuscany, and in Florence had resulted in the entire abandonment of Catholicism by masses of the population. While these flattering reports were being circulated, the press kept urging the government to go on sending ships of war to hover about the Italian coast as "a terror to evildoers," and especially to the Court of Rome—(we are quoting the *North British Review* of November, 1852)—lest there be "any measure of reaction in favor of the Papacy." "Those old idols of the Papacy that bigotry or priestcraft are dressing up again," the *Review* went on to say—"those painted Madonnas that are winking at Rimini most knowingly, or working miracles, are sadly out of date. The monks and friars and meritorious mendicants, redolent of every odor but that of sanctity, have become almost an anachronism, even in the South, and they might be left to die out peaceably. . . . The Jesuits, like witches by 'a running stream,' are standing on the brink, but have not yet crossed the Arno. To force the institutions of the worst times of the Papacy on a comparatively civilized people, against their mind and conscience, is but an idle effort at the best; and to darken and deprave a nation, with the idea of making them more submissive to both Church and State, is of all expedients the most mistaken." To prevent this debasement of a noble people the

warships of the power that had for two centuries been doing that very thing in regard to Ireland must be kept on the Italian littoral! While this campaign of malignity was being carried on in the high-class magazines of England and Scotland, the comic cartoonists were helping on the evil work by satirizing the Holy Father and the heads of the Italian States with a ribald indecency that has not been surpassed even in our own immediate day. The unscrupulous *Punch*, of London, was the ringleader in that undignified game. This campaign of ridicule was not by any means intended for fun. The fun of the boys who pelted the frogs was not firth, but malice; and so it was with the laughter that greeted the sallies of the English comic prints and the deadly satires of Mrs. Browning. They served to whet the knives of the Italian "men of action." These, in Rome, were getting ready for a move which should show that the lessons of Mazzini had not fallen upon dull ears. The Chambers were to open on the 15th of November, and on the preceding day Count Rossi was warned by the Holy Father that his life was in danger. His wife, too, had heard rumors of a conspiracy, and she pleaded with him tearfully not to attend the opening ceremony. But the Count was no coward; he only laughed at the suggestion of danger, but he had taken all the precautions that he considered necessary to prevent disorder. When he alighted from his equipage at the foot of the steps leading to the Cancellaria he was immediately hustled by a band of villainous men, flung to the ground, and a stiletto was thrust to the hilt in his neck. The assassins, it was afterwards discovered, had been practicing the scientific way to deal a fatal thrust, under the direction of a surgeon, with the help of a corpse they had procured somehow from one of the hospitals. The result justified the pains thus taken. It took but the one blow to despatch the distinguished victim. He just gasped, "O, my God!" and expired. The body was carried into the apartments of Cardinal Gazzoli, and a messenger was sent to the Holy Father to impart the dreadful tidings carefully. The Pope was for some moments unable to utter a word, so choking was his emotion; then he said: "Count Rossi has died a martyr's death; may his soul rest in peace!" In the Church of Sts. Laurence and Damasus, where the remains of the murdered Minister were laid, his tomb bears the legend. "I undertook the defense of a sacred institution; may God have mercy on me."

The murder was the signal for the opening of the floodgates of rapine, murder and destruction in the city. Bearing aloft in triumph the knife dripping with the blood of their victim, the murderers paraded the principal streets, yelling out their joy over the deed of horror, and stopping at the door of the Rossi house in order to



harrow the feelings of the widow and children by their fiendish yells of triumph over his downfall. Mazzini's teaching—"the thought and the act"—had not been in vain. Murder ran red-handed through the city of the Popes, and soon the gentle Pius was in flight from the scene of butchery. He barely escaped the same fate as his great minister, for the band of assassins who compassed the murder were soon inside the Vatican, with their sentries posted at the various gates and doors, cutting off all the avenues of escape for the Pope. They were actually roaming the buildings in search of their illustrious intended prey when his attendants quietly hurried him away and got him into the coach of the Count Von Spaur, who was waiting at the Church of SS. Marcillino and Pietro to bear the Pope toward the Neapolitan frontier. Arrived at Gaeta, from that stronghold the fugitive Pontiff issued a decree of excommunication against the murderers of Count Rossi and those who had aided and abetted them, and drew up a formal protest to the Great Powers against the usurpers of his authority now supreme in the capital of the Popes.

Mazzini soon arrived on the scene, to behold and exult in the success of his teachings. He came at an appropriate time. The dogs of anarchy had been let loose, and the red hand of the rabble was pressing the throat of the helpless aristocracy demanding its money or its life. The Republic had been proclaimed, Mazzini at its head, and two other conspirators, Saffi and Armellini, aiding him. Confiscation immediately began on a gigantic scale under the rule of this Triumvirate. Church property was the first thing to be pounced upon. Mobs burst into the churches and began plundering them of their treasures in the shape of sacred vessels and works of art. Sacrilege of a most horrible character was committed in many of them: the Blessed Sacrament was taken out and trampled under foot, and the sacred vessels were melted down for the metal they contained. A forced loan, ostensibly to carry on the government, was levied on the inhabitants of the city. The curtailment of freedom of the press, about which the Mazzinians had been always bitterly complaining, was one of the first measures taken by the Triumvirate; they did not desire the outside world to know what was taking place in the city.

Not one of the Powers recognized the Republic. The only State which acknowledged its claim to be a State was Tuscany, which had also revolted and proclaimed a Republic. The representatives of the Powers, on the other hand, presented themselves at Gaeta, in order to transact there the business of their respective governments with the Papal Government. The Pope's letter of protest had the effect of rousing the whole Catholic world outside of Italy to a sense

of the outrage of which the Holy Father had been made the victim. Louis Napoleon was then the President of the French Republic. It was the desire of the National Assembly that the Pope should be restored to his dominion and protected in his capital. A division of the army, under General Oudinot, was despatched to Civita Vecchia, and from thence moved on toward the capital. There Garibaldi, who had arrived with his motley rabble of adventurers, was in command of the defense. While this was being prepared, murders were of daily occurrence in the city. Many clerics fell under the poniards of the "liberators." The bodies of ninety priests were discovered in the cellar of the Convent of St. Calixtus, beyond the Tiber, in a short time after Garibaldi and Mazzini had been driven out by the French. All these had been the victims of the gospel of the dagger, as preached by Mazzini, Mrs. Browning and the *London Times*.

Garibaldi and his rabble did not do much beyond killing the priests. They made a stand for a while at the Gate of St. Pancratius and drove off a weak column of French, but they were soon compelled to run up the white flag and betake themselves as rapidly as they could out of the city they had terrorized and plundered. On the 3d of July the French took possession of the city, and the Pope's government was restored. The Holy Father took no reprisals for the crimes committed by the revolutionists. On the contrary, he issued a decree of amnesty for all who were not leaders, perjurers or ordinary criminals. He returned to the city, after yielding to the wishes of the Neapolitans that he would pay a visit to their city while he was a guest in the territory of the kingdom. The Holy Father visited likewise the chief cities in Tuscany and Bologna before he returned to Rome. In all of these he was received with affecting demonstrations of loyalty by the population. Even among the Garibaldian prisoners he was regarded with sincere veneration. The entry of the Holy Father into Rome did not take place until the 12th of April. He immediately settled down to the task of assuring tranquillity and restoring everything to the condition of order which had prevailed previous to the invasion of the revolutionary adventurers.

For ten years Rome enjoyed a period of immunity from political troubles, and during that time everything had moved smoothly. Two great things had been done in the religious world: the dogma of the Immaculate Conception had been defined and the dogma of Papal Infallibility decided and promulgated. The latter step aroused the hostility of many enemies who previously had been only lukewarm ones. It made enemies like Bismarck furious. But the Pope did not heed what the enemies said. He seemed to have a



prevision of the troubles which were about to burst upon the Church and the absolute need, in the near future, of a voice decisive and unquestionable to lay down the law authoritatively when the Church and the State should be divided as to questions of spiritual authority and moral right. It has proved to be a most fortunate thing for the Church that so important a step was resolved on, as recent events in France have clearly shown.

Even when the great Pope was thus taking measures for fortifying the ramparts of the doctrinal Church and its spiritual authority his crafty enemies were plotting and planning the complete overthrow of its temporal appanage, so often attacked and so often miraculously (as it seemed) restored to the Church. Cavour and Louis Napoleon were the principal intriguers on the ground; and these had the help of Lord Palmerston and English public opinion in whatever schemes might be devised for the destruction of the Papacy. It was at this juncture that help came from a most unexpected quarter. M. Guizot, formerly Prime Minister of France under Louis Philippe, in the course of a public address on primary education among French Protestants, swung off from his direct subject to call attention to the storm of persecution to which the Pope and the Church in Italy were being subjected. His words were very remarkable, coming from a man who had filled so responsible a position in diplomacy for many years and knew well the effect they were likely to produce upon the whole of Europe. He said:

"A melancholy disturbance affects a large portion of the general Christian Church. I say a melancholy disturbance; it is my own opinion that I express, and that I desire to express. Whatever differences, and even divisions, may be among us, we are all Christians, and the brethren of all Christians. The security, the dignity, the liberty of all Christian Churches, equally belong to the whole of Christendom. It is Christendom as a whole that suffers, when great Christian Churches suffer. It is the entire Christian edifice against which the blows are directed, which now strike one of its chief structures. Under such trials, our sympathy is due to the Christian Church in all its extent."

Many expressions of surprise from French Protestants, many of gratitude from Catholics, were the immediate outcome of M. Guizot's references on this subject. In order to explain his reasons more fully than he could in the course of a brief public address, the distinguished author and statesman sat down and wrote his work on "The Church and Christian Society"—a splendid contribution to the history of civilization—certainly the finest penned by non-Catholic hands.

There was in M. Guizot's day, as there is now, an organized system of assault on the citadel of faith. Belief in the supernatural was jeered at, materialism was the only doctrine taught by those who were jeered at, materialism was the only doctrine taught by those who believed and practicing it as well; and his followers were already numerous. On this point M. Guizot is very emphatic. He writes:

"It is upon faith, or an inner instinct of the supernatural, that all religion rests. I do not say every religious idea, but whatever religion is positive, practical, powerful, durable and popular. Everywhere, in all climates, at all epochs of history and in all degrees of civilization, man is animated by the sentiment—I would rather say the presentiment—that the world which he sees, the order of things in the midst of which he lives, the facts which regularly and constantly succeed each other around him, are not *all*. In vain he makes every day, in this vast universe, discoveries and conquests; in vain he observes and learnedly verifies the general laws which govern it; his thought is not enclosed in the world surrendered to his science; the spectacle of it does not suffice his soul; it is raised beyond it; it searches after and gets a glimpse of something else; it aspires higher both for the universe and itself; it aims after another destiny—another Master.

Par delà tous ces cieux le Dieu des cieux réside.

So Voltaire has said; and the God who is beyond all the skies is not Nature personified, but a Supernatural Personality. It is to this higher Personality that all religions address themselves. It is to bring men into communion with Him that they exist. Without this instinctive faith of men in the Supernatural—without a spontaneous and invincible aspiration towards it, religion would be impossible."

It will be seen that the dangers which were menacing society in the days when these thoughts were penned were little dissimilar from those with which the world is still confronted. With regard to the Church and its rights and possessions, M. Guizot contended that "the temporal power of the Papacy is as much a normal and constitutional element of the Roman Catholic Church, as the consistories and synods of the Protestant Church are an essential part of its government. Religious liberty, in the full extent of its meaning, implies that every Church shall have free scope for its own characteristic mode of action, its agencies of government and the rules and traditions which preside over them."

"No one," M. Guizot argues, "can be ignorant that, independently of religious dogmas, two essential characteristics distinguish the organization and position of the Roman Catholic Church. It has a general and sole Head, whom all Catholics, however scattered abroad



in different States, acknowledge. This Head is at once the spiritual prince of Catholicism, and the temporal prince of a small European State. A keen debate exists at present on this subject. Some profess that the union of the two characters is not necessary to the Papacy, and that it might preserve its spiritual power without retaining its temporal sovereignty. Others maintain the necessity of the temporal sovereignty for the free and certain exercise of the spiritual power. I do not enter into this debate. I do not examine here the system of government of the Catholic Church; it is its liberty, and its right to liberty, only that I defend. The twofold character of the Papacy is a fact consecrated by ages—a fact developed and upheld throughout all vicissitudes, all struggles, all distractions of Christendom. And yet we believe it possible to lay violent hands upon this fact, and to alter it at pleasure, and even destroy it, without interfering with the religious liberty of the Catholics! We can despoil the spiritual chief of the Catholic Church of a character and a position which this Church for ages has looked upon as the guarantee of its independence, and yet pretend that we do not trammel and mutilate Catholicism! There are even those who maintain that the Catholic Church has never hitherto been free, but is only about to be so. A *free Church* is the principle which some maintain in the name of the State, at the very moment that the State is taking away from the Church its constitution and its property!"

Another French statesman, of a still higher rank in the active political world, M. Adolph Thiers, held a similar view of the Pope's temporal power and of the indispensability of the Pope himself to the European cosmogony. "The only possible security for the independence of the Pope," wrote M. Thiers, "is the temporal sovereignty." The renowned English statesman, Lord Brougham, could not be brought to sympathize with the aspiration for a United Italy. Italy, he said, had never been united, but a conglomeration of different States and peoples. It is not united in a national homogenous sense even now, after forty years of so-called unification. The North still hates the South, and the South still more the North, as the comparatively recent episodes of the Crispi and Nasi defalcations, and prosecution and punishment of Nasi, amply proved. It was only the guns of the Italian warships pointed at Palermo that prevented a popular uprising against the government that had the temerity to prosecute and imprison a Sicilian because he was a dishonest Cabinet Minister! It is a race hatred of the fiercest character that prevents the two sections of the peninsula from coalescing in a bond of national unity.

No spectacle of Machiavellian duplicity so shameless was ever

presented to the world as that which was given by the Piedmontese Government and the French Emperor during the years following the return of the Pope to Rome and the treaty of Villafranca, which terminated the war between France and Austria. In return for the cession of Nice and Savoy to France, the Piedmontese King was given permission to occupy Lombardy, and soon that system of fomenting disorders on the Pope's border line by means of Garibaldian bands, and encroachment on the Pope's territory under the excuse that the Papal Government was impotent to preserve order within its own limits, was begun. When the Garibaldians set out to invade any province, a royal army was sent after them and the Chancelleries of Europe were assured that it was the King's desire to prevent breaches of treaty agreements and preserve the peace that impelled the despatch of troops to keep the Garibaldians in check. But the generals had got secret instructions to allow the revolutionists a free hand and so have the ground prepared for the grand denouement that was being carefully planned. Even the British press was obliged to own that the duplicity was indefensible in its shamelessness—the game too farcical to deceive even an infant or a simpleton. It was, however, played out to its audacious and inglorious end, with the calm cynicism of the polite highwayman who doffs his hat to his lady victims while relieving them of their money and their bijouterie. But in this case the chief gamester brought down punishment on his own head. He had played a wrong card, and lost his all. None pitied him when he fell a victim to his own dark schemes of aggrandizement and empire, after Sedan.

What has Italy gained—the world of morals gained—by the consummation of the long-drawn-out tragedy of Papal mutilation? Could any gain accrue to morality—the morality that is an indispensable element for any civilization that has to hold its social fabric together so as to be able to keep faith between nations and repress disorders—could such a morality derive any benefit from the spectacle of the open and unblushing disregard of the old law of nations by an upstart power, whose ruler had stooped to become the puppet of the very revolutionaries who hated monarchs because they were monarchs, and who scarcely sought to conceal the fact that they hated God as well? What moral end could be served by an exhibition of duplicity in the dealings with those revolutionists so cynical that it made even the defenders of it in the English press speak of it in a shame-faced way, and find no excuse for it stronger than the robber formula that necessity justifies the murder and theft? We have beheld the effect of the loosening of moral restraints toward monarchs and statesmen, in the numerous carnivals of riot and bloodshed which have reddened the great capitals of Europe since



the downfall of the Temporal Power. Those who compassed that crime had no need to point its moral. As plainly as words could speak, they said to the *hoi polloi*: "Take when you are able; keep as long as you can. Respect no authority but your own will and desires; knife all who stand for order and decency." The frightful uprising of the Commune and the burning of the Paris palaces and temples were the first fruits of that deadly lesson of anarchistic teaching; and the many sanguinary conflicts between the Russian Nihilists and the savage soldiery of the Czar were the indirect outcome of the attack on the Papacy by the rabble of Garibaldi and the regular army of the King of Piedmont. It would be easy to elaborate the catalogue of evils which were traceable to this poisoning of the general mind, but enough has been said, keeping in view the limitations of a magazine article, to maintain the proposition that open violation of international law by a strong State toward a weak one is a misfortune for the whole world, whose highest interest is the preservation of morality, among nations as well as communities and individuals. We may turn to survey the effect of the disaster upon the material and intellectual condition of the mass of the Italian people. Their fortunes were to be immediately altered for the better, according to the promises of the agitators, by reason of the removal of the influence of the Church and the substitution of the influence of the monarchy and the State. Have these roseate hopes been realized? We leave it to impartial non-Catholic observers to show, by a few extracts from their writings, how the material condition of the masses of the Italian people have been hopelessly changed for the worse, since the "unification" process was completed in spoliation; and we leave it to the governmental professors of pedagogy to show what progress has been made in the education of the people during the fifty years since the overthrow of the power which had again and again been charged, as a main count in the list of high crimes and misdemeanors which called for its crucifixion, that it had, as a device of state policy, deliberately kept the population at large in a Serbonian bog of ignorance—a veritable Slough of Despond, in the eyes of a nation the richest in the world, whose working classes, at the time the accusation was being made, were living like swine, ignorant of the very name of God and the difference between woman and beast, in the Staffordshire potteries and the "Black Country"—as the Sheffield commission on the Broadhead murders and blowings-up abundantly proved. The first blessing the "nification" brought to the Italian people was the assurance of "martial glory" for every male fortunate enough to be born under the new régime, in the shape of the conscription. Every adult Italian is obliged to serve for a period of three years under the colors

of the House of Savoy. Any one who seeks to evade this law is liable to find and imprisonment and deprivation of citizen rights. This despotism is a direct outcome of the ambition of the House of Savoy to become head of one of the "great powers," and the entry into the "Triple Alliance," to that end. We now quote a few passages from the supplemental chapter, by Dr. Wilfred C. Lay, to the work of the late Mr. John S. C. Abbot, on "Italy," relative to the material and social condition of the general population since the rape of the Temporal Power:

"Irredentism, or the political sentiment which favors *Italia Irredenta*, or 'unredeemed Italy,' is directed against the alliance with Austria and Germany, particularly the former, on account of feelings of hatred aroused in the war with that country. The Irredentists, in addition to their opposition to the Triple Alliance, have a great desire to regain for Italy the Italian-speaking provinces which were taken from her in the last war by Austria, and even the district of Ticino, which has not belonged to Italy for hundreds of years, and is now a canton of Switzerland, situated to the south of the Alps, and extending from the St. Gothard Pass almost to Como. It should be said, however, that the inhabitants of Ticino, though they speak the language of Italy, are in no wise anxious to return to her. The Irredentists on the other hand, who look upon this part of the country with longing eyes, are a strong party in Italy and are numerous in Ticino. Trieste is another province that the Irredentists would like to see returned to Italy. The Italians in this part of the Austrian territory are in the majority of the population only on the seacoast. In 1889 the estate of an Italian who died in Trieste was taken possession of by the Austrian officials. This caused extreme jealousy on the part of the Irredentists in that city, and was followed by much more stringent measures of repression against them, taken by the Austria-Hungarian Government. . . .

"A report upon the agricultural state of the country, ordered by the Parliament in 1877, had shown that the profits of farming were steadily declining and that the difficulties of successful agriculture were increasing. Disease of silk worms contributed to render the production of silk small, and blight had fallen upon the fruits and vines. Importation of silk and rice had lowered the prices of these commodities. Harder than all this to bear was the enormous taxation upon land. Twenty-two different kinds of taxes were levied upon land, and these were, in Northern Italy, more than could be borne, the chief burden being the municipal tax, sometimes nearly ten times as much as the State tax. In the province of Cremona an instance of excessive taxation showed an assessment of more than one-half the revenue of the property. Bread riots occurred in Milan



in 1886, and much damage was done to shops and other buildings by workmen, who thus protested against the new *octroi* duties. . . .

"In 1893 the peasantry in Sicily arose. Sicily, though one of the most fertile regions of the world, and for so many centuries the source of the grain supply of the Roman Empire, was at this time so mismanaged as to produce almost nothing, and the poor people were starving to death. Here again the taxes added to the burdens, and profits were annihilated by the number of hands through which every commodity had to pass. The uprising in Sicily finally assumed such grave proportions that the soldiers were called out and several war vessels were placed in the harbor of Palermo. A state of siege was kept up in Palermo. The following year all Sicily was under martial law, and the insurrection passed over to Calabria, Ancona and Lombardy on the mainland, and took the form of violent attacks upon the quarters of the military. As this movement was on the point of spreading over the whole of Italy, it was successfully checked by the royal authorities. This just saved the deposition of royalty for the establishment of a republic in Italy. In 1895 the condition of the Sicilian peasants was no better. Their burdens were heavier and their strength to bear them less. The sulphur and pyrites mines, which had given employment before to numerous miners, had now to be left unworked, the products being driven out of the market by the importation of these minerals from America. This drove the miners to the fields, which could not afford subsistence to the peasants already engaged there. In 1896 the people of Sardinia were suffering as badly as the Sicilians. They were forced to eat grass, and were at the same time hounded by the tax-gatherers; so that they were driven to either one of two evils, emigration, or, in case of failure in that direction, to crime. In other parts of Italy brigandage had revived. A German Prince was robbed by the brigands even at the outskirts of the imperial city. . . .

"Cleft in twain by the two irreconcilable elements headed by the King and the Pope, administered by a corrupt corps of public officials, which has even contaminated the banking system of the country, the people ground down to the earth by oppressive and unjust taxation, labor unable to get its proper remuneration even by a strong protection of native industries, bitter feelings against France, and, among the Irredentists, against Austria, and the wounds of her African campaigns still fresh, Italy presents a pitiable spectacle. What wonder that her subjects emigrate, and are even encouraged thereto by the government? Of national excitement there is too much, and of true patriotism too little. The rich in many cases either do not understand or deliberately ignore the condition of the poor. Anarchism has daily to be put down by the gov-

ernment, and socialism is steadily increasing. To some minds it is only a question of time when the constitutional monarchy will give place to an Italian Republic."

Now as to the position in the matter of popular education: The latest reliable return we have to hand is one for the years 1895-1899, prepared for the United States Government by Professor Alessandro Oldrini, and embodied in the Education Commissioner's Report for that year. After a pompous prologue, he says:

"So soon as the peninsula, through the holocaust of 45,000 lives, lost all along the Via Crucis of her martyrdom, and the (for her) ruinous expense of \$300,000,000, could proclaim her independence from foreign rule, the first national census was ordered (1861). Although an initial measure, difficult therefore and incomplete in its methods and results, that very first census brought to light the manifold moral and material evils of which the once glorious land had become a helpless victim.

"In certain districts of Central and Southern Italy it was then found that illiteracy had reached the average of two-thirds of the entire population, Reggio di Calabria and Catania furnishing the amazing proportion of 93 per cent. of illiterates.

"Marquis Massimo d'Azeglio, one of modern Italy's most brilliant statesmen, artist and scholar, summed up the abnormal situation thus revealed by the figures of the first Italian census of public instruction and other vital matters in these memorable words: 'Italy is made; we must now make the Italians.'"

Under a law passed in 1877 education became compulsory. What has been effected since, after a vast expenditure of money? Here are the latest tables on percentages of illiteracy:

Northern Italy.....	40.86
Central Italy.....	64.61
Southern Italy.....	83.52
Insular Italy.....	80.92

This was the position in 1888. Nine years later (July, 1897) the Hon. G. L. Peile, in a speech before the Italian Senate, summed up the whole situation in these words: "Out of 8,253 communes, only 1,800 have an elementary superior course, 6,453 having only the first course of three classes. Of the 2,166,497 registered pupils, only 412,000 reach the third year—that is, one-fifth—and of these only 176,351 (according to the statistics for 1893-1894), or eight per cent., graduate. It appears natural, therefore, that from the category of non-graduates come almost all the forty per cent. of illiterates at the time of their enlistment in the army, or twenty per cent.



in Northern Italy and fifty-seven up to sixty-three per cent. in the islands of Sardinia and Sicily; and as delinquency and illiteracy go together, this last island has the record for both in Italy."

This is the superficial position: what lies beneath, on the social side of this dark picture? We shall quote one piece of testimony out of several given in the report—and all that we have quoted is from the official reports:

"From a letter of the 'provveditore' of Campobasso (Southern Italy), accompanying the report of the inspector of his province: 'The laws of 1878 and 1888, providing for the construction of new buildings suitable for schools and for the repair of existing ones, found the communal authorities of this province reluctant. The commune of Casa Calenda only (and there are 133 communes in the province) has built a good schoolhouse. Many of the buildings that are now in use for school purposes should be absolutely given up, hygiene, pedagogy and morals imperiously requiring it.' A special law seems to be necessary to that end, as in the rural communes 'there is not a single case of decent premises that could contain fifty to seventy pupils;' and this, in certain instances, notwithstanding the good disposition of the municipalities themselves. The inspectors of Oristano (Sardinia): 'In most of our communes the schools are in unhealthy hamlets, are without a ceiling or a floor.'"

There are many more reports of a similar kind—several of them positively nauseating in their revelations as to unsanitary conditions. All these reports are official. What would have been the character of the comments that would have arisen from the British press were such an indictment possible with regard to the condition of the Papal States fifty years ago? It is not difficult to guess. The cup of Papal misgovernment would have been pronounced to be filled to the overflowing point.

We have given some testimony from Italian governmental sources concerning educational "progress" in "United Italy" under the great liberating régime of Savoy. We may now turn to another authority to learn what was the state of general education in the Papal States at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Comte de Tournon, Prefect of Rome under Napoleon (1810-1814), summarized it thus in an official report (Paris, 1831), as follows:

"Elementary instruction is afforded to the people of the Roman States with a liberality such as few countries can boast of: in the city of Rome alone eight schools, kept by the religious congregations 'Scholarum Piarum' and 'Somaschi,' fifty-two schools, called 'regionare,' or district, for boys, and an equal number for girls, are opened to the poor, some gratis, and the rest for a fee of about two

frances a month. In the country towns and villages there are masters paid by the municipal fund, who teach reading, writing and arithmetic; so that not a single child need remain deprived of the first elements of education."

This was written of conditions that prevailed nearly a hundred years ago. Since the "unification" the infidel and the followers of "L'Asino" have become the schoolmasters in Rome. What will be the moral, social and intellectual condition of the inhabitants a generation or two from this date, if no change take place in the political situation, we may well shudder to surmise. But it is day after day becoming clear to those who are capable of thinking and comparing, and estimating the future from the past, that the Papacy is indispensable to the moral welfare and the material welfare, as well as the spiritual needs, of the world.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

---

## THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE POETS—A STUDY IN OPTIMISM.

HOMER, VIRGIL AND OSSIAN.

**I**NTEREST in matters eschatological is not at white heat in our day; people are concerned with the present rather than with the future, with this world rather than with the world to come. And yet there is nothing more distinctively human than curiosity concerning the life after death. The savage, the barbarian and the so-called civilized races have all had something to say on this important subject. Philosophers have philosophized and poets have rhapsodized about it. And all that has been said is worth our careful consideration. But the poets have a special right to be heard, for the poet, as Plato tells us, is a holy and a winged thing. He is a seer, a prophet, the inspired revealer of worlds unseen. Homer and Virgil required Olympus, earth and the underworld as a setting for their great epics; Dante needed the Inferno, the Purgatorio and the Paradiso; Milton, though blind, wandered through hell, chaos and the empyrean. Ossian, Goethe, Tennyson, Browning, Newman—all these have given us glimpses of other worlds than ours. For the poets are of those who really believe in personal immortality; they are not afraid to call their souls their own. They are convinced that the universe is ultimately spiritual.

From a study of the eschatological systems of the poets various



inferences might be drawn, but there are two corollaries that stand out as especially obvious and important:

First. That without revelation the human mind is incapable of completing the broken arc that we call human life. Man-made eschatologies are unsatisfactory.

Second. That the world has advanced with the centuries in its interpretation of revelation and in its conception of the life after death. That whatever may be the indications of retrogression along other lines, in this one at least there has been marked progress. In this respect at least the world is growing better. And so to the main title, "The Eschatology of the Poets," I have added the subtitle, "A Study in Optimism."

I have taken Homer as typical of the Greek mind absolutely pagan; Virgil as representative of the Roman mind, softened and enlightened by the approach of "the fullness of time" and by stray gleams of the Messianic prophecies; Ossian as a connecting link between paganism and Christianity; Dante as the exponent of mediæval Catholicity; Tennyson as an example of a modern English non-Catholic, reverent but unable to choose between theism, pantheism and agnosticism; Browning as another type of modern English non-Catholic, eclectic, theistic, almost mystic, and, finally, Newman, a modern English Catholic, recognizing the claims of divine justice and trusting the pledge of divine mercy; keenly alive to the validity of the dogmatic teaching authority of the Church, and delicately sensitive to the faintest whisperings of the Holy Spirit in individual souls—the highest type of orthodox mystic, a Catholic saint.

A nation utters its inner self through its poets. The historian merely records its events; the statesman merely proclaims its interests; the scientist merely examines its facts. But the poet, and here we include the theologian, whether he be pagan augur or Celtic druid or Catholic priest, speaks out of its inner consciousness, revealing the deeps of its spiritual life. What reply does Hellas make to the endlessly recurring questions of the human heart? What can Hellas tell us of life beyond the ivory gate? Homer, whether he be as Goethe and Gladstone believed, "the blind old man of Scio's rocky isle," or as Wolf would persuade us, a multitudinous series of ballad singers, is surely the spokesman of the "glory that was Greece." The eleventh and twenty-fourth books of the *Odyssey* open to us the eschatology of the keenest and subtlest race that ever thought, wrote and chiseled. But it was a nation unenlightened by revelation, and we shall see the grossness of even the superfine intelligence of man, illumined by natural religion only.

This unseen world, as conceived by Homer, is divided into three

parts. First, there is the Elysian Plain on the border of the world, freshened by zephyrs from Oceanus, a place of elemental calm, untroubled by violent winds or rain or snow; a place of fruit and flowers and pleasant, toilless existence. Rhadamanthus rules this plain, and the happy wanderers in its meads of asphodel have never tasted death. Then there is the underworld proper, the general receptacle for human spirits after death. Access to it lies in the far East, near the Ocean River, a full day's sail from the Euxine, in the country of the cloud-wrapped Cimmerians. There Minos holds sway, ruling as king in a world of shadows. Finally, there is a sub-Hadean region, Tartarus, a realm as far below Hades as Hades is below the earth. Thither it is that Zeus hurls refractory members of the heavenly court. There are to be found Iapetos, Kronos and the older gods of Greece. There, far from the sun's bright rays, are the Titans, their huge forms heaving restlessly in the glooms of those nether depths. The dividing line between Hades and Tartarus was never very clearly defined, but we may say in general that while the former is for mortals, good, bad and indifferent, the latter was for deposed or condemned immortals.

It is with Hades, the place reserved for human spirits after death, that we are especially concerned. Nowhere in Homer does it receive a territorial name. It is always referred to simply as the abode of Hades, or of Hades and Persephone. It is represented as a chill, dark, dreary region, a loathsome place, abhorred by the very gods. Although Minos administers justice in its dismal courts, the shades are in general under no penal infliction. Three cases only are mentioned as cases of actual imposed suffering—those of Tityos, on whom the vulture preys; Tantalos, who stands up to the chin in a lake of cool water with thirst unslaked, and Gisyphus, who “with infinite moan tries to upheave the massy stone that ever backward slides.” But even these are held by many ancient, as well as modern, authorities to be non-Homeric, perhaps Orphic interpolations. For the Greeks had no conception of sin in the Scriptural sense of the word; they shifted the blame for wrongdoing to Ate or Fate. This is the reason we find so little remorse, so little development of the idea of penitence in Homer. Under the circumstances there could be no reward for the good, no punishment for the wicked. It is Hades for all, good and bad alike. “Is there hope?” we ask. From dead heroes comes the mournful response, “None!” “Are there no joys?” The gore-thirsty spectres pause to answer, “Yes, the possibility of drinking the sacrificial blood and recalling past delights and past affections.”

In the *Odyssey* we read how Odysseus of the many counsels, crafty Odysseus of Ithaca, weary through much wandering, begins



to long for home, for his wife, Penelope, and his son, Telemachus. But Circe had told him that the way home led through Hades; that he must consult Tiresias, the blind prophet of the underworld, if he would again see Ithaca and the Grecian towers. He sets forth, therefore, with his companions, and for a whole day sails from the palace of the sorceress with a north wind. At sunset he comes to the boundary of the ocean, where the Cimmerians dwell in clouds and darkness and perpetual night. There he goes ashore, digs a trench, pours certain libations and offers sacrifice to the gods. He then calls upon the dead to appear, and awaits their coming. Soon the shades appear, athirst for the sacrificial blood. Odysseus tries to repel them with his sword until Tiresias shall have drunk his fill and revealed the will of the gods. But Elpenor, a companion of Odysseus, presses forward. This Elpenor was a vulgar craven who had lost his life by falling from the ship in a fit of intoxication. He implores the tribute of a tear and a tomb on the surrounding shore. Then Tiresias comes forth, Tiresias the great Theban seer, Tiresias the virtuous, Tiresias beloved of Minerva and favored by the gods, Tiresias who understood the language of birds and flowers and disembodied spirits—Tiresias here in the same dungeon with Elpenor, the graceless wine-drinker, who, all unmarked by his companions, fell from the masted ship down to the regions of the strengthless dead. Tiresias forecasts the future for Odysseus, gives him the necessary directions for his safe homecoming, explains that only those spirits that drink the sacrificial blood can recall the past and then vanishes into the gloomy grottoes of the dead.

Then Odysseus waves his sword and permits the shades to approach the gore. As soon as they have drunk they recognize him and speak with him. All tell the same tale: Any kind of life here on earth would be pleasanter than their shadowy, unreal existence. Anticlea, the mother of the hero, drinks and then asks:

How is it, O my son, that you alive  
These deadly, darksome regions underdive?

Three times the son advances to embrace his mother, and three times she dissolves into thin air. Then, bemoaning her fate, she urges him to leave the underworld in all haste and to return to the sunlight and the land of the living.

Achilles drinks, and straightway asks how any mortal could be found willing to descend into the sad realms of Pluto. Odysseus answers:

I was induced to invade  
These under parts, most excellent of Greece,  
To visit wise Tiresias for advice  
Of virtue to direct my voyage home  
To rugged Ithaca. . . .

Thou, Thetis' son,  
Hast equaled all that ever yet have won  
The bliss the earth yields, or hereafter shall.  
In life thy eminence was adored of all,  
Even with the gods; and now, tho' dead, I see  
Thy virtues propagate thy empery  
To a renewed life of command beneath;  
So great Achilles triumphs over death.

But Achilles answers:

Urge not my death to me, nor rub that wound;  
I rather wish to live on earth a swain,  
Or serve a swain for hire, that scarce can gain  
Bread to sustain him, than, that life once gone,  
Of all the dead sway the imperial throne.

This is the universal testimony. To be sure, Minos bears a golden sceptre and mighty Orion drives his herds as of old, the herds he slaughtered in other days on the hills of earth. But these are shadows, too. Who would care to carry the shadow of a sceptre or to drive mist-wrapped flocks over sunless fields?

The cosmogony implied in all this is just the sort that might be expected from a reading of Hesiod and a study of the Greek theogony; the theodicy, just the sort that would be demanded by "that motley crew of the gods of old," as Goethe calls them. Such a crew! These so-called gods not only contend with men, but also quarrel among themselves. Diomedes wounds Aphrodite, the foam-born, and the ichor flows. Athene barely escapes the lance of Ares, and immediately retaliates by flinging a stone that lays the god of war sprawling in the dust. Besides, there is scarcely an immortal that is not outwitted and made ridiculous either by gods or men. Hera is hung up in mid-air by the great wielder of thunderbolts himself, and Hephaistos, her son, is hurled from heaven by the same august deity. For a whole day he spins through empty space, until at nightfall Semnos receives him, or what remains of him. Thereafter he goes limping through the heavenly courts and sets the blessed gods alaughing. Physically as well as mentally, the Olympians are below par as divinities. They do not see or hear any too well. They seem to hear only when spoken to. When they move from place to place, they mount steeds or ride chariots. Even Hermes needs his sandals, and Zeus slides earthward in a shower of gold.

As for moral goodness, no deed is too dark, no depth too deep for the gods of Hellas. No wonder that Plato in his ideal republic found no place for Homer and his motley crew; no wonder he thought it better to banish the poets than to be burdened by such deities.

But centuries passed—eight or nine of them—and then, seventy



years before the birth of Prince Peaceful, Virgil appeared upon the scene. He was born in Northern Italy, near Mantua, in what was then Cisalpine Gaul. From his childhood he loved Epicurus and Plato, and at one time vowed to devote himself entirely to the study of philosophy. Perhaps in later years, when he was weary of courts and courtiers, he often regretted that he had not kept that youthful vow. He was modest to rusticity, sensitive to a fault; a man of books, as Horace was a man of the world. He never could arrange his toga to suit the votaries of fashion, and he always wore shoes too large for his feet. In an age of unrest and unbelief he tried to harmonize the new knowledge with the old faith, and such attempts were as difficult then as now. In short, he was a poet and a philosopher, or perhaps it would be sufficient to say simply he was a philosopher. For the poet, when he leans on truth, is a philosopher, Plato tells us, and Virgil always leaned on truth.

The time was drawing near to Christ. Hebrew prophecies had drifted into Greece with Alexander the Great, and thence had floated into Rome. Clearer expectations of a coming Messiah had traveled westward in the train of events that followed Pompey's subjugation of Syria. The air was growing softer, the vision clearer. It was not yet the full aurora, but all the eastern hills were white with promise. Out of the purple half-lights of that early mornbreak came Virgil singing a new song, at first wavering and uncertain, but at last clear and steady and thrillingly prophetic of the dawn. As early as the pontificate of St. Marcellinus the Martyr Constantine had read the Fourth Eclogue to a council of Bishops, and decided that Christ was the hero of the poem. Through all the succeeding centuries Virgil has been regarded by some as a magician, by others as a saint. In the primitive days of the Church his verses were engraved in the catacombs, along with the cross and the monogram of our Lord. In the Middle Ages he was painted into pictures of the Nativity with David and the prophets. In the fourteenth century Dante chose him as his guide through the nether world. We all remember the words with which the great Florentine addressed him on his first appearance:

And art thou then that Virgil, that well-spring  
From which such copious floods of eloquence  
Have issued?  
Glory and delight of all the tuneful train,  
May it avail me that I long with zeal  
Have sought thy volume, and with love immense  
Have conn'd it o'er, my master thou and guide.

And in the nineteenth century our own Tennyson sings:

I salute thee, Mantovano,  
I that loved thee since my day began,  
Wielder of the stateliest measure  
Ever moulded by the lips of man.

It is in the fifth and sixth books of the *Æneid* that *Æneas* makes his descent into *Avernus*. How much is *Homer*? How much *Virgil*? In the fifth book the shade of *Anchises* appears to “pious *Æneas*”—*Æneas* is almost too “pious” for our modern taste—and addresses him thus:

Note in this extract that the Homeric divisions of the unseen world are retained—we have Elysium, Avernus, or Hades, and Tartarus. Insomuch Virgil follows Homer. But note, too, that Virgil does not exalt the body as Homer does. Anchises is not a mere shadow. His soul dwells in Elysian courts and enjoys the conversation of the good and wise. This is a Virgilian innovation, or is it an echo from the dialogues of Plato, an intimation of a blessed immortality preserved from those early years so eagerly consecrated to philosophy and the things of the mind?

The sixth book, the Book of the Sybil, as Wilstach calls it, opens with Æneas at Cumæ seeking an interview with the priestess of Apollo. Under her auspices he consults the god. The oracle gives a shadowy picture of struggle in the Roman future, but declares



that Juno will finally be won over unalterably to the cause of the Trojans. The Sybil then informs Æneas that no one can enter the lower world without the golden bough sacred to Juno, to be taken as a gift to Proserpina. The hero, guided by the doves of Venus, penetrates into a dense woods and secures the branch. Then he offers sacrifice to the gods and, accompanied by the Sybil, enters the realms of the dead. They pass together through the woes of Avernus and hear the moans and horrid shrieks that rise from the depths of Tartarus. Finally they reach Elysium, where they meet the good and great of all former ages—poets and heroes, priests and patriots. Here they deposit the golden branch, as commanded by the oracle. Then they meet Anchises, who explains to them the laws and mysteries of nature and foretells the future of Æneas and of his descendants. As they wander together over the Elysian Plain they come to the two gates of sleep—one of horn, the other of shining ivory. Here Anchises bids Æneas and the Sybil farewell and dismisses them through the ivory portal.

This whole book is a distinct advance upon Homer. There is a definite graduation of reward and punishment. There is Tartarus, a place of torment and suffering, through whose black caverns wander "all the faint, unhappy hosts of hell;" there is Elysium, an abode described as

Full of joy, delightful, green,  
Through woodlands fortunate spread and happy seats  
A freer air here clothed the fields, a light  
That purple glowed. A sun its own, and stars  
Its own, it had.

And, finally, there is Avernus, a sort of middle state, where certain souls suffer for a time before entering the Elysian Fields. Here, as in Homer, Minos rules, but in addition he

Moves the urn and calls  
The silent jury and inquires of lives  
And crimes and true indictments hears and weighs.

As soon as we have a just judge and "true indictments" life takes on a deeper meaning, the ethical circle becomes complete. A theory of good and evil can be constructed; the freedom of the human will can be assumed; mind can be postulated as the ruling force in the cosmos. This is just what we find in Virgil. For while Fate is mentioned seventy-nine times as a controlling power in human affairs, yet the gods are always superior to it, and even man may overturn its blind decrees. In the Second Georgic we read:

Happy the man whose mind the causes grasps  
From which depend all things we see or know,  
And who beneath his feet hath placed all fear  
And with it fate, inexorable fate.

It is noteworthy, too, that Anchises in his Elysian speech to Æneas

explicitly states that it is mind, an intelligent mind, that moves the universe. He says:

The heaven, at first, and earth and watery fields,  
The moon's bright globe and the Titanian stars,  
An inward Spirit feeds, and, poured throughout  
All parts and particles, there doth exist  
A Mind intelligent which moves the mass  
And mingles with the body vast of things.

This "mind intelligent" may be another reminiscence of Virgil's Platonic studies. Indeed, I think it would not be difficult to prove that Virgil's debt to the author of the *Dialogues* was as great, if not greater, than his debt to Homer. A little further on in his speech Anchises explains that souls return to earth and live again in the body by a process of cyclic transmigration. This is distinctly an Aristoclean tradition. Anchises says:

Each soul its own doth suffer. And therefrom  
Through wide Elysium we are sent. A few  
The happy fields retain until long time,  
A cycle full, the ingrained stain hath cleansed,  
And pure hath left that heavenly tone divine,  
That fiery vigor, full as unmixed air,  
It once received. Then all, when hath revolved  
The wheeling circle of a thousand years,  
A god calls forth in mighty band, the shore  
Of Lethe's stream upon, that they, of naught  
The memory having kept, again may see  
The upper world, and may to take once more  
A bodily form be well content and pleased.

"A mind intelligent" back of nature; free will as the basis of human conduct; moral evil or sin the only real evil; death but a transition—a happy one for the just man; judgment, slow perhaps, but none the less sure; certain reward for the good, certain punishment for the wicked; this is the general scheme of Virgil's eschatology. It is an eclectic system. Through it we catch glimpses of the rustic deities of the Roman peasant and bits of popular superstition; into it are woven the gods and goddesses of the Homeric theogony, and occasionally there are hints of foreign divinities, as, for instance, the mention of the Phrygian goddess Cybele. Here we have them all again—"that motley crew of the gods of old." And Virgil does the best he can with them. In the first place, he introduces them far more sparingly than Homer; they interfere less in the affairs of men. Jove has become juster; Juno gentler. Somehow the crew has been changed into an hierarchy. When the Virgilian gods come together they form a dignified assemblage. Jupiter enjoys unquestioned primacy and presides with true Roman majesty. It is evident that with all Virgil's talk of gods and goddesses he had his misgivings in favor of monotheism.

And yet Virgil is often classified as a pantheist, and inference based on his insistence upon one mind as the moving force in the universe. But pantheism is non-ethical in its implications—it makes



no distinction between good and evil—and Virgil is first, last and always a moralist. He is nothing if not ethical. He wrote always with a keen sense of responsibility for his writing, with a definite determination to make reason and the will of God prevail. He felt that the times were out of joint and saw the hopelessness of trying to set them right. And yet he put himself resolutely to the task. To the worldly he sang of unworldliness; to the selfish and hard-hearted of mercy for the weak and tenderness for the down-trodden; to all of “a higher life than this daily one, and a brighter world than that we see.” His works were published under the patronage of the Emperor and had an immense circulation. Of their influence we may judge by comparing the age of Augustus with the age of the Antonines, Cicero with Marcus Aurelius. There was a vast difference, and the difference was due in great part to Master Virgil.

Along about the middle of the eighteenth century James Macpherson, a young schoolmaster from Inverness, published a small volume entitled “Fragments of Poetry Collected in the Highlands of Scotland and Translated from the Gaelic or Erse Language.” An immense interest was at once excited among the literati of Scotland. Forthwith at a dinner of professors and antiquarians, it was resolved to institute a search for further poetic remains and a subscription was voted for the purpose. Upon inquiry the author of the “Fragments” was found likely to prove the most suitable candidate for the undertaking. The quest was committed to him, and two years later he published his prose translation of the poems of Ossian.

Ossian was an ancient Gaelic bard whose songs had been sung for centuries on all the Scottish Highlands and at every Irish hearth-side. Macpherson simply collected and translated those tales of the times of old. But the way of the translator is hard. The blameless pedagogue soon found himself and his two volumes the centre of a literary storm which was to last for over a century. No one seemed to be able to decide whether Macpherson was the Homer or the Pisistratus of the Ossianic Sagas. A thunderbolt from Dr. Johnson came first, as might have been expected. The so-called poems, he said, were not poems at all, but so much bombast and fustian. When Blair asked him whether he thought any modern could have written Fingal or Temora, he replied: “Yes, sir; many men, many women and many children.” A momentary calm succeeded; the great man had spoken. Then some one suggested that Scotland, in claiming Ossian, was stealing Irish laurels. The Irish at once took up the matter and opined that if anything of merit or originality could be found in Macpherson’s translation, it was Irish, of course; if not, it was Scottish beyond the peradventure of a doubt.

But darker clouds were gathering. The opinion was becoming general that the "Fragments" and the two later volumes were out and out literary forgeries. At this point Gray broke into the discussion to say that Macpherson was either the very demon of poetry or he had in truth lighted upon a treasure hid for ages. Later on Wordsworth read the volumes and registered his verdict thus: "The spirit of Ossian was glorious, but Macpherson's Ossian is trash." Napoleon, Goethe, Herder and Schiller sided with Gray; they were ready to admire Ossian or Macpherson as the case might require. But not until 1862—a full century after the opening of the controversy—was the question of authenticity finally settled. In that year a collection made by James Macgregor and known as the "Book of the Dean of Lismore" was given to the world and the Caledonian schoolmaster was formally, though somewhat tardily, acquitted. From that collection made in the sixteenth century and from certain investigations conducted by the Highland Society, it became evident that such poetry as that published by Macpherson had been in actual existence in Scotland for centuries. Henceforth it would be impossible to declare the translation altogether spurious. It turned out in the end that Wordsworth was the only one who had hit upon the truth in the matter. He was right about the spirit of Ossian and right about the style of Macpherson. The one was glorious; the other trash.

The bard of the glorious spirit belongs to the latter half of the third century. We know that he was the son of the hero Fionn and the father of the brave Oscar. We know that he survived all his kindred, and that he found himself alone in the world, blind, forlorn and bowed with years. One only solace remained to him—Malvina, the betrothed of his dead son. Then it was that the past became more vivid than the present. Then it was that the blind bard raised his voice and sang the glories of other days and the immortal deeds of heroes that were no more. He lived in a period of transition, an age of waning faith and half-hearted enthusiasms. No more did the Archdruid go forth to the capstone of the Cromlech leading a white-robed procession and followed by a throng of reverent worshippers; no more did he raise the golden sickle and cut from the oak, symbol of deity, the mistletoe, emblem of man. Druidism was dead. In its deserted rock-caverns dwelt the priests of an unknown God, and through its sacred oak groves came the mysterious accents of a strange ritual and a new faith. Ossian belongs neither to the old order nor to the new; he is the connecting link between Druidism and Christianity.

The Druids had some fairly definite notions concerning the life after death; the Christians had Revelation and could see as through



a glass darkly. But Ossian is all fog and mist and cloud. He has no theogony; there is very little divine machinery in his poems. If there are any gods, they go their ways in peace, and man is left to go his in peacelessness. Some commentators think that the Spirit of Loda represents the spirit of nature or the universe and is identical with the Odin of Scandinavia. But Loda himself is nothing but a ghost. In the poem *Cath-Loda*, Starno and Swaran consult this spirit concerning the issue of the battle with Fingal. Together the two warriors seek a mossy covert near the foaming course of a spring. There from the top of a dark cloud peers a ghost half formed of shadowy smoke. A voice comes forth and mingles with the roar of the waters. Bending low under a blasted rock the two heroes receive his words. In another poem, "*Carric-Thura*," Fingal has an encounter with this same spirit. He cleaves it with his spear and defies its prophecies. In Macpherson's translation we read:

"A blast came from the mountain; on its wings was the spirit of Loda. He came to his place in his terrors and shook his dusky spear. His eyes appear like flames in his dark face; his voice is like distant thunder. Fingal advanced his spear in the night and raised his voice on high: 'Son of night, retire; call thy winds and fly! Why dost thou come to my presence with thy shadowy arms? Do I fear thy gloomy form, spirit of dismal Loda? Weak is thy shield of clouds, feeble is that meteor, thy sword! The blast rolls them together, and thou thyself art lost. Fly from my presence, son of night! Call thy winds and fly!'

"'Dost thou force me from my place?' replied a hollow voice. 'The people bend before me. I turn the battle in the field of the brave. I look on the nations and they vanish; my nostrils pour the blast of death. I come abroad on the winds; the tempests are before my face. But my dwelling is calm above the clouds; the fields of my rest are pleasant.'

"'Dwell in thy peaceful fields,' said Fingal. 'Do my steps ascend from my fields into thy peaceful plains? Do I meet thee with a spear on thy cloud, Spirit of dismal Loda? Why then dost thou frown on me? Why shake thine airy spear? Thou frownest in vain. I never fled from the mighty in war and shall the sons of the wind frighten the King of Morven? No; he knows the weakness of their arms.'

"'Fly to thy land,' replied the form. 'Receive the wind and fly! The blasts are in the hollow of my hand; the course of the streams is mine. The King of Gora is my son; he bends at the stone of my power. His battle is around Carric-Thura, and he will prevail. Fly to thy land, son of Cromhal, or feel my flaming wrath!'

"He lifted high his shadowy spear. He bent forward his dread-

ful height. Fingal, advancing, drew his sword, the blade of dark brown Luno. The gleaming path of the steel winds through the gloomy ghost. The form fell shapeless into air, like a column of smoke, which the staff of the boy disturbs as it rises from the half extinguished furnace. The Spirit of Loda shrieked, as rolled into himself he rose on the wind."

This seems to be Ossian's nearest approach to a god, but a god that shrieks and "rolls into himself," undone by a single spear thrust, and that from a mortal, is little better than no god at all.

Of death and the dead Ossian speaks often and always in the same strain. Misty Loda in the billowy bay of Uthorno receives the spirits of the departed and is in general the official residence of the dead. There in his cloudy halls Cruth-Loda of the swords presides and hands the sounding shells to the advancing ridges of formless shades. They take a melancholy pleasure in drinking from the hollow shells, in conversing with the friends of their youth and in knowing that great is their fame in the land of the living. But the ghosts of Ossian are seldom at home. They wander at will over the hills of earth; they slide on moonbeams, hang on clouds and ride on the whistling blasts. As dim phantoms of the air, they appear to friend or foe, to warn or threaten, to promise victory or to foretell disaster. In the epic poem "Fingal," the ghost of Crugal, an Irish hero slain in battle, appears to Connal to foretell the defeat of Cuthullin and to urge that peace be made with Swaran. The whole episode, even in the translation, is worth noting:

"Connal lay by the sound of the mountain stream," we read, "beneath an aged tree. A stone with its moss supported his head. Shrill through the heath of Lena, he heard the voice of night. At a distance from the heroes he lay; the son of the sword feared no foe. The hero beheld in his rest a dark red stream of fire rushing down the hill. Crugal sat upon the beam, a chief who fell in fight. He fell by the hand of Swaran, striving in the battle of heroes. His face is like the beam of the setting moon. His robes are of the clouds of the hill. His eyes are two decaying flames. Dark is the wound in his breast. 'Crugal,' said the mighty Connal, 'why so pale and sad, thou breaker of the shields? Thou hast never been pale from fear! What disturbs the departed Crugal?' Dim and in tears he stood and stretched his pale hand over the hero. Faintly he raised his feeble voice like the gale of a reedy river:

"'My spirit, Connal, is on my hills; my corse on the sands of Erin. Thou shalt never find the lone steps of Crugal on the heath. I am light as the blast of Cromla. I move like the shadow of mist. Connal, son of Colgar, I see a cloud of death; it hovers dark over the plain of Lena. The sons of green Erin must fall. Remove



from the field of ghosts.' Like the darkened moon he retired in the midst of the whistling blast. 'Stay,' said the mighty Connal, 'stay, my dark red friend. . . . What cave is thy lonely house? What green-headed hill the place of thy repose? Shall we not hear thee in the storm? In the noise of the mountain stream? When the feeble sons of the wind come forth and scarcely see pass over the desert?'

"The soft-voiced Connal rose in the midst of his sounding arms. He struck his shield above Cuthullin. The son of battle waked. 'Why,' said the ruler of the car, 'comes Connal through my night? My spear might turn against the sound and Cuthullin mourn the death of a friend. Speak, Connal; thy counsel is the sun of heaven.' 'Son of Semo,' replied the chief, 'the ghost of Crugal came from his cave. The stars dim-twinkled through his form. His voice was like the sound of a distant stream. He is a messenger of death. He speaks of the dark and narrow house. Sue for peace, O chief of Erin, or fly over the heath of Lena.'"

Could anything be more weird and eerie, more fearsome or awe-inspiring than that one line, "The stars dim-twinkled through his form?" Cuthullin listens, but remains unmoved. "I fear not death; to fly I fear," he replies, and goes forth to battle. But Cuthullin is defeated and Crugal's prophecy is fulfilled.

Ossian, like Homer, has no conception of sin in the scriptural sense of the word. But he loves virtue for its own sake. Unfaithfulness to friend, to loved one or to country is considered deep ~~perfidy~~ <sup>perfidy</sup>; fairness and generosity to all, even to enemies, is considered noble and magnanimous. Where the ethical standard is thus high one would expect a system of sanctions—happiness for the righteous, pain and remorse for the unrighteous. But Ossian is silent on this point. His shades weep and sigh, but it is over the defeat of earthly friends; they exult and are glad, but it is over the downfall of their enemies. As Connal tells us in the second book of "Fingal:" "Ghosts fly on clouds and ride on winds. They rest together in their caves and talk of mortal men." This earth seems to be their chief concern, even after death. If there is any distinction in bliss it is in favor of the victorious warrior. In misty Loda, Cruth-Loda of swords "offers the sounding shells to those who shone in arms; but between him and the feeble his shield rises, a darkened orb. He sets meteors to the weak in arms." Weakness is held in contempt always. The principal objection to being a ghost is that ghosthood implies unsubstantiality and general strengthlessness. The dead are a feeble, weak-kneed race. Even the Spirit of Loda, the king of them all, falls powerless under the onset of Fingal and sinks out of sight shrieking in anything but kingly fashion.

But apart from this inconvenient shadowiness the ghosts of Ossian are happy in their own way. Their misty halls and cloud-capped hills are a great improvement upon the underworld of Homer. Even the Virgilian heroes might be glad to exchange imprisonment in Elysium for the freedom of the highland hills. What self-respecting ghost would choose to be confined in one place, even if that place were Elysium? And what is the use of being disembodied if the limitations of space are to be as binding as ever?

This is about all that can be said of the eschatology of Ossian. After the most careful scrutiny, his system remains tantalizingly vague and obscure. His theories are as elusive as his ghosts. We seek something definite and tangible, and find only the gray of highland mists and the purple of the heatherbloom. There are no gods, unless perhaps the spirit of dismal Loda be one; there is no conception of sin as an infraction of a law, but evil is hated for its ugliness and virtue is loved for its exceeding beauty. The life after death is too unreal and impalpable to be desirable, though the ghosts seem to enjoy it after a fashion. That is about all we can say. Of a Paradise or an Elysium, Ossian gives no hint. But he must have been familiar with the tradition of a Tir-na-n-Og, an island of the blessed, far out in the storm-tossed Atlantic, a happy land far off to westward, where death and sorrow were unknown, where joy and peace and tranquillity were perpetual. Perhaps deep in his heart he nursed a dim hope that there might be something in those dreams after all. Perhaps when the end came at last, he really did find a light canoe waiting for him, the canoe that always waits for souls that have loved righteousness and hated iniquity. Perhaps instead of following the hollow voice of the spirit of dismal Loda, he leaped into a dream-craft bound for Tir-na-n-Og and sailed away to

A land of youth, a land of rest,  
A land from sorrow free;  
A land far off in the golden west,  
On the verge of the azure sea.  
Past a sunlit strand  
To a golden land  
From druids and demons free,  
To the land of rest  
In the golden west,  
On the verge of the azure sea.

M. A. DUNNE.



## THE LAST EMPRESS OF THE FRENCH.

QUITE a big book might be written about the influence of woman—or, as Bismarck expressed it, “the eternal feminine”—in politics. If the part played by the sex in *la haute politique* during the nineteenth century was recounted and reviewed no inconsiderable share should be ascribed to the Empress Eugenie, although to all outward seeming the beautiful wife of Napoleon III. was more a leader of fashion than a political personage.

Those skillful or curious in drawing out analogies will note a significant similarity between the events which accompanied her entrance into the world and her exit as a dethroned Empress from the capital, in which for nineteen years she was not only the cynosure of neighboring eyes, but of eyes far and near. Her premature birth, on May 5, 1826, in the city of Granada, in Southern Spain, was preluded by an earthquake, and her hasty departure from the Tuileries in the autumn of 1870, after the crushing catastrophe of Sedan, was in the midst of the social upheaval that followed the disastrous war with Prussia, which extinguished one empire and created another beyond the Rhine.

Some, it is said, are born to greatness, some achieve greatness and some have greatness thrust upon them. The daughter of the Count and Countess of Teba—afterwards known as the Count and Countess Montijo—comes under the last named category. The Spaniards, it is well known, revel in long-winded names, and customarily exhaust all the letters of the alphabet and all the saints in the calendar in lengthening out the patronimics of their offspring. Though known during her childhood as simply Eugenia Palafox, she was inscribed in the baptismal register as Maria Eugenia Ignacia Augustina, daughter of Don Cipriano Guzman Palafox y Portocarrero, Count of Teba, and of his wife, Maria Manuela Kirkpatrick y Grevignée. Of mixed race, the blood of Spain, Italy and Scotland flowed in her veins. The Palafoxes were of Aragonian origin. In the middle of the eighteenth century Don Philip, second son of the head of the family, married Dona Francisca de Sales Portocarrero y Zuniga, who among her many titles bore that of sixth Countess of Montijo, and was connected with some of the greatest houses in Spain. His two sons, Eugenio and Cipriano, were Counts respectively of Montijo and of Teba and grandees of Spain. The Portocarreros came from Genoa to Spain in the fourteenth century, while the Kirkpatricks of Closeburn traced their descent from one Ivone de Kirkpatrick early in the twelfth century, although it is claimed that the latter family had estates in Nithsdale and Annandale four hundred

years earlier, a legendary genealogy connecting them with Finn MacCumhaill, or Fingal, the son-in-law of King Cormac and general of the famed Fianna Eirinn, or ancient Irish militia, whose achievements were the themes of legend, romance and song. Ivone's grandson, who bore the same name, married a daughter of Robert Bruce, Lord of Annandale and Cleveland, grandfather of the Scottish King, celebrated in Burns' martial lyric. There were two branches of the Kirkpatricks, those of Closeburn, the elder branch, and those of Kirkmichael, the younger branch, who took their distinctive name from the estate of Kirkmichael, in Dumfriesshire, bestowed upon them about 1848 by James III. The conflict between the Stuarts and the Williamites led to their connection with Spain. The Kirkpatricks were staunch adherents of the ill-fated Stuarts. Sir Thomas, of the Closeburn line, remained in Scotland after the flights of James II. and VII., but refused an earldom offered to him by William of Orange. Robert and George, of the younger branch, great-great-grandsons of Alexander, fled to Ireland, where the latter settled and founded the Irish family of Kirkpatrick, the former following Prince Charles Stuart in the perilous path of the insurrection of 1745 and paying the penalty of his patriotism and loyalty the year following, when he was beheaded. His son William married a Miss Wilson and became the father of a numerous family, one of whom, named after him, went to Spain and settled in Malaga, where he prospered as a wine and fruit merchant, and in 1791 was appointed United States Consul, marrying the daughter of another merchant settler, Henri de Grevigné, of Liège, who had taken as wife a Spanish lady, Francisca de Gallegros. His youngest daughter, Maria Manuela, who assisted him in the retail sale of his wines, captured the heart and title of Colonel Palafox, an ardent Bonapartist, who, like the Scotch lairds, was poor and proud. Though he was then only a fortuneless colonel of artillery, he was Count of Teba and inherited subsequently his brother's title of Count de Montijo and his ample means. In order to obtain King Ferdinand's consent to the union of a Spanish grandee with the daughter of a foreign trader, Don Cipriano had to procure proof from Edinburgh of his wife's claim to aristocratic descent. Her father said to his proposed son-in-law: "You trace up to King Alfonso XI.; if I trace to King Robert Bruce, I suppose His Majesty will be satisfied." A patent from the Heralds' Office at Edinburgh, certifying descent paternally from the ancient Barons of Closeburn, having been laid before the King, he laughingly exclaimed: "Let the noble Montijo marry the daughter of Fingal." Blood, it is said, will tell, and the Scotch strain in the Count of Teba was clearly discernible. While the Countess, who had been educated in Paris and who shone



as a musician, a linguist and a conversationalist and was regarded as the most cultivated woman in Spain, was fond of spending, her husband was as careful of the bawbees as any thrifty Scot. This expenditure displeased his brother, estranged from them by divergent politics, but he was won round and became godfather to her second child, named after him Eugenia, a name she was destined to make in its Frenchified form famous and popular. When, in the summer of 1834, political agitation was at white heat in Spain, massacres taking place in the streets of Madrid, and a cholera epidemic was ravaging the country, the Count sent his family for safety to France. At the age of eight the little Andalusian child, whom Washington Irving dandled on his knee when he visited Granada, first set foot in France, of which for nineteen years she was to be the Empress. In 1837 she and her elder sister, Francisca, who afterwards became Duchess of Berwick and Alba, were sent as boarders to the Convent of the Sacred Heart, in the Rue de Varennes, where they remained until their father's death, in 1839, when Eugénie was sent to a school at Clifton, near Bristol.

With an income of £4,000 a year, a house in Madrid and an estate in the country, the widowed Countess de Montijo was free to gratify her tastes as a *grande dame* and to exercise her talents as a match-maker. Having married her elder daughter Francisca to the Duke of Berwick and Alba<sup>1</sup> in 1844, she had only the younger one to dispose of, and she disposed of her to the best advantage. She is described by Prosper Mérimée at this period as "marvelously beautiful, with just that shade of hair that Titian loved." The story that she attempted to poison herself when she overheard the Duke's interview with her mother is probably apocryphal, as the closest ties of affection between the two sisters remained unbroken up to the Duchess' death. She shared in and added to her ambitious mother's social triumphs. At least three Dukes are said to have laid their coronets at her feet. She was very much in evidence. People talked of her riding in the streets of Madrid on a fiery barebacked horse, with a cigarette in her mouth; of her appearance in brilliant Andalusian costumes at bull-fights, with a whip in place of a fan in her hand and a dagger in her belt, with red satin boots on her feet and flowers and jewels in the broad golden plaits of her hair; of her presentation, in the rôle of Queen of Beauty, of the prize for the most successful toreador; of her swimming feats and her fencing. She made as great an impression on Madrid society by her vivacity and her eccentricity as by her beauty. While her mother was made *Camerara Mayor* to Queen Isabella, Eugénie was appointed maid

---

<sup>1</sup> James Stuart Fitzjames, eighth Duke of Berwick and fourteenth of Alba, was the descendant of one of the sons of James II. by Arabella Churchill.

of honor, but in 1847 they were deprived of their posts. The daughter is said to have expressed a wish to enter a convent, but was induced by her mother to accompany her on a European tour. One version of the incident represents Eugénie as having actually reached the convent when she was met by an old nun, who said: "My daughter, do not seek for rest within our walls;-you are called to adorn a throne."

They were in London in 1848, when, it is alleged, she met for the first time the man who was to make her Empress of the French. Some antedate this first chance meeting to her childhood, when, at ten years of age, she accompanied her mother and sister on a visit to Madame Gabriel Delessert, wife of the Prefect of Police. It was the 12th of November, and on that day Louis Napoleon was brought a prisoner to the Prefect's house after the failure of the Strasburg plot, prior to his being exiled to the United States. Others make it synchronize with his return to London after Boulogne *coup de théâtre* and his escape from Ham. Filon, Prosper Mérimée's biographer, dates from the arrival of the Countess de Montijo and her daughter in Paris towards the close of 1849 the authentic history of Louis Napoleon's relations with Mdle. de Montijo, as she was then called. It was the banker, Baron James de Rothschild, who introduced the Montijos to the Prince-President, at whose receptions at the Elysée he first fell under the witchery of the brilliantly beautiful Andalusian, who later, in her youthful enthusiasm, wrote to him before the *Coup d'Etat* of 1851, placing all her fortune at his disposal. It was the classic diction reversed. Instead of Cæsar being able to say "*Veni, vidi, vici*," it was she who came, saw and conquered Cæsar.

On the morrow of the *Coup d'Etat* Adolphe Thiers said sententiously, "*L'Empire est fait*." When, on its first anniversary, Napoleon III. began his reign, Troplong, the Premier, begged him, in the name of the Senate, to marry in order to secure the dynasty. A few months earlier, when the Senate had declined to hand over the crown jewels in its custody until the Prince-President should have married, he said: "*Je ne suis pas pressé*." If he was not in a hurry then, events soon after hastened his decision. All efforts to secure the hand of one of the numerous unmarried Princes proved abortive. The European royalties, particularly the royal houses of Northern Europe, regarded the proposed alliance as undesirable. The shadow of the Terror still brooded over France, and, remembering the fate of Marie Antoinette, they were loth to entrust any of their daughters to the insecure occupant of an insecure throne. He was in the humiliating position of a lot put up for auction for which no bidders could be found, although one or two were willing enough to take



him, like old books at a book sale, "with all faults." Religious and moral objections—though these do not appear to weigh much with royalties past or present—were raised when the Princess Adelaide of Hohenlohe, a niece of Queen Victoria, was suggested. Meanwhile Mdlle. de Montijo, carefully "coached" by her matchmaking mother, played her cards astutely, determined to win the trick. His infatuation for the handsome Spaniard was so evident that his half-brother Morny<sup>2</sup> prophesied, "She will be Empress," a prophecy he confirmed himself, saying to Walewski, "*Mon cher, je suis surpris!*" explaining that he was resolved to marry Mdlle. de Montijo. He did not, however, carry out his resolution until he was "civilly declined" by the Princess Adelaide. He had taken no pains to conceal his admiration. At a hunt in Compiègne forest on December 20, 1852, he was said with difficulty to leave her side as, clothed in a close-fitting habit, with a diamond clasped ostrich feather in her hat, spurs on her high heels and a pearl-handled whip in her hand, she rode her thoroughbred horse, disdaining the ordinary ladies' saddle. During a morning walk over the still dewy lawns of Compiègne, admiring the capricious and magical effects of light, she called his particular attention to a clover leaf so gracefully hung with dewdrops as to look like a real gem. When the walk was over the Emperor drew aside Count Baccischi, who set out for Paris a few minutes later. Next day he brought back a charming trinket in the exact form of a trefoil, each of whose leaves bore a superb diamond drop. In the evening a lottery took place, in which it was arranged that the jewel should fall to her who had admired the clover on the lawns of Compiègne. On another occasion, while walking at her side, he asked her whether in her life she had ever had a serious attachment. "I should deceive you, sire," she is reported to have answered, "if I did not confess that my heart has been touched—more than once even. But I have never forgotten that I am Mdlle. de Montijo." "Then, mademoiselle," said Napoleon, "you shall be Empress." She remarked that some of his guests were inclined to slight her, whereon he broke off a branch from a hedge, twisted it into a crown, and put it on her head, saying: "While you wait for the other!" On the last night of 1852, at a reception at the Tuileries, a French lady of rank made a sneering remark about "Mademoiselle de Montijo," as she passed her in the Salle des Maréchaux. Eugénie, who was being escorted by Toulangeon, one of Napoleon's military supporters, caught the remark and, deeply hurt, went to the Emperor and desired leave to withdraw from a court where she was insulted. He pacified her with the promise that he would avenge her, and on New Year's Day, 1853, sent to her mother a definite offer for her hand. It was, of

<sup>2</sup> The Duke de Morny, an illegitimate son of Napoleon's mother, Hortense.

course, accepted, but the engagement was not made public until January 19. Some doubt as to the exact date of the proposal is raised by the Hohenlohe negotiations, and it has been contended that he did not bind himself irrevocably until the middle of January. It has even been alleged that a morganatic marriage, scornfully rejected by mother and daughter, was suggested before he fully committed himself to a definite engagement. "Napoleon," says a writer<sup>3</sup> who has investigated the subject very fully, "appears to have acted like a man distraught between reasons of love and State. Unable to gain the love he desired without the gift of a crown, and urged by his Ministers to bestow that crown elsewhere, he delayed to the last moment an absolute decision. In his very difficult position, that was hardly reprehensible. As for the attitude of the Countess of Montijo and her daughter, assuredly neither had any reason to be ashamed of the part which she played."

Despite the disapproval of his family—his cousin Mathilde, whom he once thought of marrying and who was the devoted friend of him and his cause, going down on her knees to beg him not to compromise himself—despite the opposition of his Ministers, some of whom threatened to resign, the indignation of France, the prejudices of Europe, the sneers of society and public amazement, evidenced by a fall on the Bourse as soon as the news became definitely known, the imperial suitor was true to his plighted word. So much stands to his credit, whatever his faults were. The speech in which he officially announced his decision to the assembled Senate, Legislative Body and Council of State was equally creditable as a frank and manly utterance. "This union which I am contracting," he said, "is not in accordance with the political traditions of old. Therein lies its advantage. By a succession of revolutions France has abruptly separated herself from the rest of Europe. A wise government must seek her return within the pale of the ancient monarchies; but this result will be much more certainly attained by a frank and upright policy, by loyal conduct than by royal alliances, which create false security and often substitute family interests for those of the nation.

. . . When, in the face of old Europe, a man is borne upward by the force of a new principle to the height of the ancient dynasties, it is not by attributing antiquity to his escutcheon and by seeking at all costs to introduce himself into the family of Kings that he makes himself acceptable. Rather it is by remembering always his origin, by preserving his own character and by frankly taking up in the face of Europe the position of a *parvenu*—a glorious title when one wins it by the free suffrages of a great nation. As I was obliged

<sup>3</sup> "The Last Empress of the French," being the life of the Empress Eugénie, wife of Napoleon III., by Philip W. Sergeant, B. A., pp. 59-60.



to depart from the precedents followed up till now, my marriage became simply a private matter. There remained only the choice of the person. She whom I have chosen is of exalted birth. French by education and by the memory of the blood her father shed in the cause of the empire,<sup>4</sup> she has the advantage, as a Spaniard, of having no family in France to whom honors and dignities must be given. Endowed with every quality of mind, she will be an ornament to the throne, and in the hour of danger one of its bravest defenders. A devout Catholic, she will address her prayers with mine to heaven for the welfare of France. Gracious and good, she will, I firmly hope, exhibit in the same position the virtues of the Empress Josephine. So, gentlemen, I am here to say to France: 'I have preferred a woman whom I love and respect to an unknown, an alliance with whom might with its advantages have brought the necessity for sacrifices. Without disrespect to any one, I yield to my inclinations.' Soon I shall go to Notre Dame to present the Empress to the people and the army. Their confidence in me will assure their sympathy for her whom I have chosen, and you, gentlemen, when you learn to know her, will be convinced that once more I have been inspired by Providence."

In the word "*parvenu*," used advisedly, there is a note of defiant resentment towards the old royalties, particularly the Hapsburgs, who had repelled his matrimonial advances, and an echo of the Second Republic.

"This marriage," observed a French statesman, "is a lovely poem. The Emperor rivals M. de Musset, and his reign, I fear, will be but 'the song of a night.'" "The Emperor," said Lamartine, "has just realized the most beautiful dream possible to man—to raise the woman he loves above all other women."

Meanwhile, the bride-elect, pending the marriage, celebrated with great pomp at Notre Dame by Archbishop Sibour,<sup>5</sup> lived with her mother at 12 Place Vendôme, "wearing," it was said, "the incipient honors of her approaching rank quite as if she had a consciousness that they were not superior to her merits," and already winning popularity by visiting the Convent of the Sacred Heart, where she was warmly greeted by the nuns, helping a workman who fell from a scaffolding in one of the streets of Paris as she passed, and declin-

<sup>4</sup> Don Cipriano Palafox was a devoted adherent of Napoleon I. At Salamanca he lost an eye and broke a leg on behalf of France; at Buttes-Chaumont, in 1814, he was wounded, receiving a French decoration in reward for his valiant services to the First Empire.

<sup>5</sup> The Emperor was wishful that Pope Pius IX. should come to Paris to perform the ceremony, but His Holiness, who later suffered spoliation of the Papal patrimony with the connivance of Napoleon III., refrained from treading the same path as Pius VII.

ing the gift of a diamond *parure* from the city of Paris, and asking the Municipal Council to devote the 600,000 francs voted for its purchase to charity, which led to the foundation of a school for sixty young girls of the poorest class, in which they should be kept and trained until situations were found for them.

The exhilarating cup of pleasure which fortune presented to her lips, and which might well have intoxicated many, was not without its *aliquid amari*. "I do not know whether to be happy or to weep," wrote her mother to one of her oldest French friends, the Marquis of Roche-Lambert; "Eugénie is to be Queen over your France, and I can but remember that your Queens have had little happiness. In spite of myself, I am possessed by the thought of Marie Antoinette, and I wonder whether my child may not suffer the same fate." Prejudice, like bigotry, dies hard, and envy is only conquered by death. While the working class showed signs of reconciliation to the idea of an Empress not of royal blood, the upper section of society, on which Napoleon's hold was very precarious, remained for the most part unfriendly. A busy campaign of scandal against the Emperor's choice was carried on, and anonymous libels were so freely circulated that the Prefect of Police found it necessary to give orders that any one found spreading unfavorable reports about her should be arrested with a view to prosecution. These underhand attacks continued after the wedding, and ultimately led to a number of arrests.<sup>6</sup>

The French, histrionic in everything, above all love a picturesque *mise-en-scène*, and the imperial wedding was stage-managed in a way to fully gratify their tastes for the spectacular. But as the bride and bridegroom, after the civil ceremony, were driving from the Tuileries to Notre Dame in the gilded coach, drawn by eight white horses, which had carried Napoleon I. and Josephine to the same Notre Dame on the 2d of December, 1804, and Napoleon and Marie Louise to their wedding on April 2, 1810, the large imperial crown surmounting it fell off just as the Tuileries' triumphal arch was passed, and a halt had to be made to replace it. It was remembered that the same thing had happened to Napoleon I. and Marie Louise, and it was regarded as somewhat ominous. When, nineteen years later, the Man of December became the Man of Sedan, and the imperial crown fell off the head of one whose public career, as Philip W. Sergeant<sup>7</sup> says, "Commenced in ridicule, continued amid suspicion and contemptuous hostility, emerged into brilliant triumph, and closed in utter humiliation," there was no replacing it.

After the honeymoon at Saint Cloud the Empress, who had divided

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 73-74.

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 86.



the 250,000 included in the Emperor's wedding present between the maternity societies and the Incurable Hospital, began her reign as Queen of Beauty in that court of the Second Empire of which so much has been said and written. The Countess Stéphanie de Tascher de la Pagerie, the Emperor's kinswoman on the Beauharnais side, who in her "*Mon Sejour aux Tuileries*" has given us so many interesting and graphic glimpses of it, describes Eugénie as one who "might serve as a model to a sculptor for Hebe or Psyche." The Monday evening entertainments or "*lundis*," as they were called, which she devised to relieve the dullness of a court modeled on that of the First Empire, furnished food for malicious gossip, while the absence of an aristocracy, properly so called—the old aristocrats of the Faubourg Saint Germain holding proudly aloof—deprived it of that tone and *cachet* of distinction which long descent and high breeding alone can impart. The Emperor himself bewailed this to English visitors, and was fain to recruit his courtiers from a very mixed crowd, some of them very underbred. Napoleon III., like his uncle, was not remarkable for the conjugal virtues, and a high moral tone could not be expected in court circles in which Prince Napoleon, derisively called "Plon-Plon" and described as the "most prodigiously intelligent and most prodigiously vicious man that ever lived," his sister, Princess Mathilde, the Countess Castiglione, Morny, an illegitimate son of Queen Hortense (mother of Napoleon III.) and Walewski, and the illegitimate offspring of Napoleon I. were among the ruling spirits. As time went on it became worse, until all decency was often outraged at the costume balls, and the dividing line between the Grand Monde and the Demi-Monde was almost obliterated. In point of morality there was not much difference between some of the *lorettes* who mixed in court circles and the painted courtesans who frequented the Jardin Mabille. The epoch from 1860 to 1863, when the Second Empire reached its apogee, has been described as the Age of Woman, when the brilliant Austrian, Princess Pauline Metternich, carried the court to the giddiest height of frivolity. The Countess Stéphanie de Tascher admits that there was "a touch of the Palais Royal about her," and Prosper Mérimée thought her "quite an odd mixture of *lorette* and *grande dame*." Her entertainments wound up with a smoking concert, at which the hostess smoked like a trooper and sang songs of somewhat doubtful character, learnt from a popular music hall artist. She is described as "the brilliant star of the constellation of women which made the court so famous." Another star who moved in the same orbit, the Countess Castiglione, possessed attractions which it needed virtue to resist; and virtue, it is noted, was not the point on which men

---

<sup>8</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 275-276.

prided themselves in the circles in which she triumphed. She was the most famous beauty of the court next to the Empress, but when her beauty decayed she shut herself up in a house where no mirrors were allowed, and ultimately died in solitude. The great entertainments were the *fêtes* at Compiègne, the hunting parties, the galas on the lake, with Merimée, court poet, reciting his verses in a boat to the Empress and her ladies, and the court balls in Paris. The sensation of the evening at a fancy ball at the opening of the Hôtel d'Albe in April, 1860, was the appearance of the Princess Mathilde disguised as an Egyptian fellah woman in a way that shocked the imperial family and so affected the pious Princess Clothilde that she refused to go to another fancy dress ball after that; for she was a devout Catholic, whose whole life, except when her household duties required her attention, was given up to religious practices. "The amusements of the court of the Second Empire," says Mr. Sergeant, "attained an undue contemporary notoriety owing to the unrestrained license of gossip which had prevailed in the early days of the reign and was even more noticeable now. It would be grossly unfair, where this gossip is preserved in a certain class of memoirs, to treat what is merely the equivalent of a low type of society journalism as if it were history. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that there were occasions when the censors, genuine or pretended, had good ground for their severity. The court included many whose characters were not concealed by their talents or their looks. Men like Morny, women like *la belle* Castiglione, and worse than they, could not bring honor on those with whom they associated."<sup>8</sup>

Nothing redounds more to the credit of the Empress Eugénie than that she should have lived for nineteen years in this *milieu* and come out of it with her moral reputation untarnished. The fierce light that beats upon a throne—and the searchlight of criticism projected upon her was often directed with malevolent intentions—failed to reveal any big blots. The worst fault they could impute to her was setting a pernicious example of luxury and frequent changes of fashion, which all France followed, though she assured Dr. Evars at Farnborough that she never spent more than 1,500 francs on any dress, and stated in a letter to an American friend in 1906 that only three times in her life did she wear a dress that cost as much as forty guineas, one being her wedding dress and another her costume at the baptism of the Prince Imperial. Against this—against the magnificence and extravagance of her court in the early sixties—is to be set off her expenditure on charity, generous to lavishness; for, besides her responses to innumerable begging letters, she opened her pursestrings freely and frequently to aid institutions, hospitals, orphanages, etc., while the Emperor's almsgiving was more lavish

still, amounting to 10,000 francs a day. She gave, besides her money, her personal service, and in this resembled the De Gondis and other truly noble ladies, who coöperated with St. Vincent de Paul in relieving misery in the France of their day.

During the cholera epidemic of 1866 she won the admiration of all France by her heroism. The scare, Mr. Sergeant relates, was at its height at Amiens when she arrived there. She immediately "went under fire," as she expressed it, visiting the victims in hospital and showing herself without the slightest fear of death. Already she had shown an example by her visits to the hospitals when cases of cholera were occurring in Paris in the previous autumn. But it was at Amiens that she created the great sensation. She went from building to building, speaking to every patient and not shrinking from actual contact. An incident which particularly touched the people's hearts was when, two children being pointed out to her as orphaned by the scourge, she adopted them and gave orders that they should be cared for at once. Nor did it escape attention that while she exposed herself unsparingly to the risk of cholera she refused to allow any of her ladies to accompany her. When she left the afflicted city it was amid the blessings of all its people, and the fame of the "Sister of Charity" followed her far. A few months later when she appeared at Nancy to represent the Emperor at the celebration of the centenary of Lorraine's incorporation with France, tales of Amiens were on every one's lips. Her slanderers for the moment were dumb.

It is related that sometimes in the mornings, very soberly clad, she would drive in an unofficial carriage, kept for the purpose, to the house of a petitioner and would personally investigate the merits of the case. We have it on the authority of Madame Carette that she "re-formed" the greater part of her wardrobe twice a year, giving the disused clothes to her women, who sold them at good prices in America. When, after the birth of the Prince Imperial, a popular collection for a present to the child, though limited to subscriptions not exceeding five cents, reached a total of 100,000 francs, in compliance with her wishes the sum was devoted to the foundation of a "Prince Imperial's Orphanage." It was these traits in her character which doubtless helped to secure her the good-will and friendship of Queen Victoria, which gave her a certain status, as the attitude of other European courts had placed her previously in an equivocal position, not being of royal birth and the wife of an avowed *parvenu*. The English Queen wrote of her: "She is full of courage and spirits, and yet so gentle, with such innocence and *enjouement*, that the *ensemble* is most charming. With all her great liveliness she has the prettiest and most modest manner." A still higher



tribute was paid to her by Pius IX. when, five days after the baptism of the Prince Imperial, of whom he was godfather, he bestowed on her, through the intermediary of the Papal Legate, Cardinal Patrizi, the Golden Rose, the highest religious honor reserved for women. This—a rose bush of gold growing from a vase of the same metal on a base of lapis lazuli, adorned with two bas-reliefs representing the birth and presentation of the Blessed Virgin and with the Papal and Napoleonic arms—she kept in her bed room in the Tuileries, together with a palm blessed and sent to her by the Pope on every anniversary.

Notwithstanding all the frivolity and *frou frou* of the court and her shady environment, her southern temperament and love of gaiety, she was thoroughly Catholic in sentiment and conviction. Doubly Catholic, as she called herself, Catholic both as a Spaniard born and as Empress of the French, she strongly disapproved and strove, but in vain, to combat the anti-Papal trend of her husband's later policy, to which the Irsini attempt in 1858 on the life of the ex-Carbonaro of 1831 may have been the impelling motive. Before his marriage he had warned her of the possibility of his being any day assassinated by her side; and after the bombs exploded on the night of January 14, 1858, when they were driving through the Rue Lepelletier to the Opera House, and people crowded round her and Napoleon, she preserved an admirable calm, simply remarking: "Don't trouble about us. This is part of our profession. Look after the wounded."

French intervention in Italy, which made the year 1859 memorable and epoch-making, was curiously preluded by a journey through Brittany, the great stronghold in France of Catholicism and Legitimism, with its stirring memories and memorials of La Vendée and Rochejaquelein. Whether it was or was not planned with the design of throwing public opinion off the scent of his Italian plot, concocted with Victor Emmanuel and Cavour, it rallied the Bishops and clergy to his side as "Eldest Son of the Church." In less than a year the son betrayed the father. When leaving Paris for the brief war with Austria, which ended abruptly in the peace of Villafranca, he ominously declared that "Italy must be free from the Alps to Adriatic." The defeat of the Austrians at Magenta and their consequent withdrawal from the Papal territory resulted in a rising in the legations and a throwing off of the Pope's rule. The pamphlet on "The Pope and the Congress," published anonymously, but known to be his, proposed the restriction of the Pope's temporal rule to the territory immediately around Rome. The Empress is reported to have declared that if the Pope was driven from the Quirinal she would leave the Tuileries, and in the heat of her indignation exclaimed: "I would rather see the Emperor dead than damned

forever!" Though she was powerless to prevent the alienation of the Papal States, her influence secured for a time the maintenance of the French garrison in Rome, and she threw herself into the reaction which followed the spoliation. The Pope excommunicated Victor Emmanuel and withdrew his favor from the imperial family of France, and when, a few years later, a prominent French courtier paid his respects at the Vatican, he found Pius IX. apparently not at all interested in news of his godson or that godson's parents. When next the courtier called, the Pope said to him as he left: "You must tell our godson, the Prince Imperial, that we remember him—in our prayers." After the chivalrous effort of General Lamoricière and the Papal Brigade, chiefly recruited in France, Belgium and Ireland, to preserve the patrimony of Peter failed, and little remained to the Pope outside Rome, secured only by the presence of Napoleon's garrison, she said to Lord Malmesbury "that no scandal could be greater than an exiled Pope with no foot of earth belonging independently to himself, and that the honor of France was engaged to protect him from being driven out of Rome." And when, in 1866, regardless of the entreaties of the Empress, he carried out the terms of his compact with Victor Emmanuel and withdrew the French garrison, she said: "You may call it what you will, instinct, presentiment or superstition; I am convinced that my son will not mount the throne if we forsake the Holy Father." The words were prophetic, as the sequel sadly proved. The Second Empire did not survive the extinction of the temporal power, and the assegai of a Zulu extinguished all hope of a Bonapartist succession. The downfall of the empire may be dated from Napoleon's interference in Italy. The Italian liberationists scouted the idea of a confederation with the Pope as honorary President, and ultimately nothing was left to him but, as Edmond About suggested, "the Vatican and a garden." With the exception of the acquisition of Savoy and Nice, Napoleon failed to win the stakes for which he gambled, and only succeeded in largely helping to call into existence a strong neighbor on France's southeastern frontier in place of a number of weak States. Blunder followed blunder and one disaster was succeeded by another before the empire finally fell. The futile attempt to introduce absolutism in juxtaposition to a strong republic by establishing a monarchy of European origin in Mexico as a counterpoise to the United States, and the subsequent abandonment of the Archduke Maximilian to his fate, while his unhappy wife was driven to insanity, was both a crime and a blunder which left an ineffaceable stigma upon the Emperor and the empire, hastening both to their ruin. Outwitted by Bismarck in his manœuvre to annex the Duchy of Luxembourg, by which he hoped to compensate France for the

Prussian triumph of 1866, he still strove to make a volatile and pleasure-loving people forget the Mexican fiasco in the round of gaieties and splendid displays which accompanied the great exhibition of 1867, when Paris was crowded with a brilliant array of royalties and their suites and the Empress gracefully dispensed the hospitalities of the palace to a succession of admiring potentates. The King and Crown Prince of Prussia and Bismarck were among the group of notabilities who surrounded Napoleon at the review of sixty thousand French troops in the Bois de Boulogne on the 6th of June. In the midst of the spectacular achievement of a universal exhibition, which it was hoped would "mark a new era of harmony and progress"—although the harmony was marred by an attempt on the life of the Czar Alexander II. and the tragedy of Queretaro, where the Emperor Maximilian was shot, paying by his heroic death the penalty of Napoleon's mistake—none foresaw that in three years the arms of France and Germany would clash in a conflict that would be the death-throes of the Second Empire; that host and guests of the exhibition year would be confronting each other as enemies, and that the Empress of the French would be appealing to the Czar of Russia in the vain hope of mitigating the hard terms of the victorious Prussians in the autumn of 1870.

Thrice Empress Regent, she was first invested with semi-independent control of the State during the Emperor's absence in 1859 in the campaign against Austria, after both had assisted at a farewell Mass in the Tuileries chapel, the Empress looking like a marble statue absorbed in prayer. This brief war was the outcome of the famous interview with Cavour at Plombières and was prefaced by the circulation of a pamphlet entitled "*Napoleon III. et l'Italie*," urging a complete reconstruction of Italy, universally attributed to the Emperor himself. The second regency was in 1864 during the Emperor's visit to Algeria and the third, which ended with the fall of the empire and her flight from Paris, during the war of 1870, the war into which Ollivier, falsely assured that France was "thrice prepared," went "with a light heart." People called it "her war," but, as all the world now knows, it was long foreseen and arranged by Germany, into the hands of whose more cool-headed and calculating statesmen the impetuous Gramont and the bellicose Leboeuf played, and that it was the *redaction* by Bismarck of a telegram, giving a falsified account of the King of Prussia's last interview with Benedetti at Ems, that precipitated the conflict, France falling into the trap that had been laid for her. It was the Second Empire's last card; the last throw of the dice; the gamester's last stake, hazarding all. On the night of the declaration of war, as she was strolling in the park at Saint Cloud with her ladies and Baron



Vareigne, the latter rallied her on her extreme melancholy, whereupon, asking how could she be free from care, she added: "The honor of France is at stake; but what disaster will follow if fortune goes against us! We have but one card to play. If we are not successful, France will not only be dismembered, but swallowed up by the most frightful revolution ever witnessed." A few days after the outbreak of war she said significantly: "In case of a defeat I prefer my son to be with the army. I do not wish him to be made a little Louis XVII." Her words were again prophetic. The Second Empire played its last card and lost.

Chaos reigned in Paris when it was known that the French army was in full retreat. When she read the last words of the Emperor's ciphered message, "All may yet be retrieved," she fell on her knees and began to weep. Admiral de la Gravière tried to calm her, when she turned to him and said: "I thank God that there is still room for hope." But, in her own words, it was no longer a question of saving the empire, but of saving France. Ollivier, attacked in the streets by the frenzied people, was forced to resign and retired to Switzerland; the Emperor, so ill that he could hardly sit a horse,<sup>9</sup> handed over the chief command to Bazaine; it was feared the mob would wreck the Bourse and sack the palace; the Empress was practically confined in the Tuileries, it being no longer safe for her to show herself in the streets, while the common talk among the crowd and in the cafés was of deposing the dynasty. The Emperor sent Trochu to Paris "to open the door of the Tuileries" to him by his popularity, but the Empress steadfastly opposed his return, telegraphing to Châlons: "Do not think of coming back unless you wish to let loose a terrible revolution. People would say you were running away from danger." Trochu played false. Although he knelt and kissed her hand, exclaiming, "Madame, I am a Breton, a Catholic and a soldier, and will serve you to the death!" he abandoned her in her hour of greatest need.

Mérimée describes the Empress' conduct during "the long torture" of the autumn of 1870 as "truly saintly" and deserving of "all admiration." Her time was mainly divided between the Council of Regency and hospital work, for she had turned a great part of the Tuileries into a shelter for the wounded pouring back from the front, unable to get any rest owing to the excessive mental and physical strain. When, on the afternoon of Saturday, September 3, she read Napoleon's telegraphed announcements of his defeat and capture at Sedan, that having failed to meet death in the midst of his soldiers, he had surrendered himself to save the army, she fell back

---

his "extraordinary heroism" in sitting in the saddle for five hours at Sedan.

<sup>9</sup> Sir Henry Thompson, who operated on him in January, 1872, spoke of

into a chair and after a moment of agonized silence withdrew into an inner room. On somewhat recovering her composure she told the Council that there must be no blood shed in her defense and declined an extra guard for the Tuileries, opposing a motion to remove the government from Paris. The Legislative Body, invited to elect five representatives to assist the Regency, replied by requesting her to hand over her powers to them. Her response was that she could not consent in the hour of danger to abandon the post confided to her and betray her trust; that if she was an encumbrance the Deputies must pronounce the deposition, and eloquently pleaded that the wise and patriotic course was for them to rally round her and the government and unite in opposing the invaders. But the Deputies were firm and she was compelled to yield, declaring that nothing could hereafter remove the bitter memory of that hour for her, the crowned sovereign of their holidays, whom they were driving away in the time of peril.

The Second Empire was at an end. Only the last vestiges of its rule remained to be swept away. From the early hours of Sunday morning, when the placards in the streets revealed the story of Sedan, revolution was on foot. Crowds were gathering everywhere. Round the Tuileries were what Count Irisson d'Hérisson graphically describes as "the ragged creatures with sinister heads, watching the palace, come no one knew whence and only seen at such times." Like beasts of prey waiting for a spring, they surrounded the enclosure of the Tuileries. Gradually they began to press against the railings and to knock the eagles off the gates. The ordinary garrison of Imperial Guards was drawn up in front of the main entrance, but plainly it would not be able to protect the palace against the mob. Moreover, the Empress again insisted that not a single drop of blood should be shed for her, and would hear of no firing on the people. There was only one alternative. At half-past three the Prefect of Police rushed into the palace crying: "We are betrayed! We cannot resist; the crowd is breaking down the railings. Her Majesty's one hope lies in immediate flight!" Metternich and Nigra, the Austrian and Italian Ambassadors, had already led her to the window and pointed out the mob surrounding the railings. Always mindful of Marie Antoinette, Eugénie exclaimed: "They shall not have a second Queen to insult!" As she bade good-bye to her ladies, of whom only Madame Lebreton was to accompany her, she exclaimed: "In France no one has the right to be unfortunate;" and, turning back for a last look as she passed out of the room, she uttered the parting words: "No, not *adieu!* *Au revoir!* We shall meet again, shall we not?" So hurried was her departure that when the palace was entered by the new government's

agents on the Empress' dressing table were found a handkerchief and a bag containing some wearing apparel, while a waiting woman in tears said to them: "She has gone without even a handkerchief." While the fugitive and her small escort stood in a doorway waiting for a cab a street arab, who recognized them, was silenced by a kick from the Italian Ambassador. Then they drove off, the Empress thus giving the contradiction to her asseveration: "I shall never run away in a cab like Charles X. and Louis Philippe."<sup>10</sup>

The exciting narrative of her escape to Trouville and thence across the channel to England in Sir John Burgoyne's yacht has been minutely related by the American dentist, Dr. Thomas Evans, in his "Memoirs," a chivalrous service to the fallen Empress which has earned for him the title of "the one hero" in her career. Before she reached the coast the Third Republic was proclaimed, with Trochu as President.

It was not long before France saw two of her finest provinces wrenched from her by the victors, who imposed a war indemnity that would have crushed any other nation. Then came the *année terrible*, when the Communists held Paris until dislodged by the Versailles troops after the massacre of their hostages, including Mgr. Darboy, Archbishop of Paris,<sup>11</sup> who had celebrated Mass for the Emperor and Empress and Prince Imperial on the eve of the departure for the seat of war of the first and last named, who were fated never to return.

The widowed ex-Empress, now in her eighty-fourth year and bereaved of husband and son, has, during her long exile, had ample time to reflect upon the vanity of human wishes, to meditate upon the text of the royal seer upon which Thackeray loved to treat. She has long outlived the empire of which she was the *decus* if not the *tutamen*, her goodness and grace counterbalancing its mistakes and misdeeds; fairest of the fair<sup>12</sup> among all the court beauties of

<sup>10</sup> P. W. Sergeant, *op. cit.*, pp. 370-374.

<sup>11</sup> During the Eastertide of 1868 Mgr. Darboy invited to dinner the shepherd, Maximin, who, with the shepherdess, Melanie, had the vision of our Lady on La Salette, desirous of extracting the secret alleged to have been confided to him on that occasion. The young man refused to reveal it, but, on being pressed, said: "Monseigneur, you want to know my secret; you are doing all you can to get me to tell it to you. But I assure you if I told you, you would not believe me!" The Archbishop said he would, and the young man replied: "Well, if I told you that in three years you will be shot dead, would you believe me?" "Certainly not," said the prelate. Then the shepherd added: "Monseigneur, if you don't believe that, you'd believe nothing from me." There were several dignitaries of the Paris clergy present. One of them reminded Mgr. Darbois of the incident when he was in prison in 1871. It helped him to accept his martyrdom with resignation. (See "Nouvelle Defense du Secret de la Bergère des Alpes par Amédée Nicolas, avocat." Nîmes: 1884, p. 87.)

<sup>12</sup> The American Minister at Madrid said: "Looked upon simply as a woman, she was the most perfect creation I have seen anywhere."



her reign, a vision of loveliness amid much that was unlovely. She has lived and moved in the Vanity Fair held betimes at Saint Cloud, Compiègne, Fontainebleau and the Tuileries; a "laughable, pathetic jumble," in which it was sought to unite the revived splendor and gaiety of the declining days of the old régime to a mushroom monarchy, a democraticized and liberalized empire. All the splendor and profusion which reminded Mérimée of Belshazzar's feast in Martin's picture have vanished like a dissolving view; revels and revelers have passed away, while one who filled a leading part among the *dramatis persona* in the tragi-comedy of the Second Empire, in a masquerade that lasted nearly two decades until it was played out in the Dance of Death at Sedan, until the curtain was dropped upon the closing scene and all the actors therein must have realized in the retrospect of a long life the truth of the words: *Vanitas vanitatum, et omnia vanitas*.

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Cork, Ireland.

---

#### THE BLESSED VIRGIN IN THE YORK CYCLE OF MIRACLE PLAYS.

NO PERIOD of literary activity demands greater accuracy of historical perspective than the period of the English miracle play. Any attempt to ignore the dominant characteristics of mediæval civilization—however varied and seemingly inconsistent they may appear—must end in a misinterpretation of the whole matter. The Church had struggled for centuries with elements of discord inseparable from the assimilation of pagan nations. She had been forced to suffer the tyranny of ignorance, but with the first dawn of freedom she set herself to remedy the evil by the foundation of schools and universities. "Documents of all ages," says Stevenson in the preface to "*Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*," "even in the darkest periods, bear testimony to the great zeal of the Church in the cause of education."<sup>1</sup>

The Church called to her aid the learning which had so long enjoyed a safe refuge within the cloister, and bade it yield its wealth of accumulated knowledge. A fuller and more general appreciation among the laity of man's relations to his Creator brought a deepening sense of devotion, which revealed itself in holy living and accidentally in the splendor of liturgical ceremony and the presentation of scenes from the life of our Lord. The leaven of sound

---

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Stevenson, "*Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*," London, 1858, Vol. II., p. 65.

doctrine had penetrated into every phase of life. The claims of religion were unquestioned. The Church proposed to every man a complete system of belief and practice, and that, too, with Divine authority. This explains what has always been a puzzle to writers not thoroughly versed in ecclesiastical history, namely, that the critical, brilliant minds of the Middle Ages obeyed with childlike docility the *magisterium* of the Church in all that pertained to faith or morals.

So sure were they of the credibility of their faith, so far removed from doubt and so joyous in their sense of security that they allowed in their religious drama occasionally more of the ludicrous than would be considered decorous in our own day. Professor Hamelius, referring to this license, as seen in the drama, says: "Cain being so near the devil, what is more natural than to give him the bitter grin and shameless jokes which the Evil One usually displays in the Mysteries? If the modern descendants of the Puritans are shocked at the merriment thus called forth, let them find fault with their own narrowness of mind rather than with the broad and healthy philosophy of the Middle Ages, that was able to look at religious subjects without constrained gravity and to associate them naturally with all its feelings and experiences."<sup>2</sup>

It is because of the new interest in mediæval drama, made possible by the labors of the early English text societies, that scholars have turned their attention to the work of investigating the stage of the later Middle Ages. Many of the plays then produced are extant. It becomes the duty of students of that period to search out their origin, their influence and the manner of their presentation.

Dodsley, in the preface to his "Old Plays," dismissed the subject of early mediæval drama in these words: "What has been said of the mysteries and moralities it is hoped will be sufficient just to show the reader what the nature of them was. I should have been glad to be more particular, but where materials are not to be had the building must be deficient. And, to say the truth, a more particular knowledge of these things, any farther than as it serves to show the turn and genius of our ancestors and the progressive refinement of our language, was so little worth preserving that the loss of it is scarce to be regretted."

Modern scholars have adopted an entirely different view from that of the famous publisher. The change is due in a large measure to the reversal of historical judgment in all that relates to the period of the miracle play. Mr. Frederick Stokes, in his introduction to Dr. Maitland's "Dark Ages," says: "Perhaps no period of Chris-

---

<sup>2</sup> Paul Hamelius, "The Character of Cain in the Towneley Plays," *Journal of Comparative Literature*, Vol. I, p. 343.

tianity has been more misjudged than the Dark Ages—an epoch which, in the present work, is taken as comprising the ninth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries. The general tradition when Maitland wrote—a tradition which has been greatly modified by later historians, like Hallam and Gasquet—was that these ages were almost wholly barbaric ages of ignorance, superstition, oppression and general misery. Perhaps writers of the twenty-first century will take a similar view of the nineteenth, and regard it as a time when the world was desolated by famine, war, pestilence; when the condition of the poor was as harsh as it has ever been; when men were subject to conscription, invasion, misgovernment. The writers of the first half of this century looked down with scorn upon the centuries before the Reformation, yet historians like Walpole pronounce an almost equally severe verdict upon the times when George the Third was king. The Anglican churchmen of the last century were emphatic in their denunciations of the abuses of the pre-Reformation times. The general verdict of churchmen of our own times as to the state of the Church of England in the eighteenth century is the reverse of flattering. It would be easy indeed, by treating the Anglican Church in the eighteenth century as many Protestant writers, notably Robertson, have treated the Church of the Middle Ages, to prove that it was as dark as any century of the Christian era.”<sup>3</sup>

Mr. Philip S. Allen voices the general sentiment of present-day writers in pleading for a broader view of the Middle Ages. He says: “If we were to reduce to words the mental picture which many of us have of the past, I imagine the following vision, or something like it, would be the result: Two great mountain ranges confront one another, on the summits of either of which loom ‘far-shining cities and stately porticoes.’ One of these cloud-capped peaks is the Graeco-Roman world, the other is the modern world. Half way down the side of the former of these ranges are the dwellers of the Silver Age; half way up the side of the latter range are the dwellers of the age of the Renaissance. But uncounted fathoms beneath in the dark valley is the night of the Dark Ages, and there in the grim hollow of ignorance and superstition dwells pre-mediæval man. . . . So no objection should be raised to classifying six hundred odd years as the Dark Ages and four hundred more as Middle Ages, were it not for a single element of danger which clings to such nomenclature. This danger is that many people—among them some who are old enough to know better—think these years so called because they are dark or because they

<sup>3</sup> Frederick Stokes, Introduction to Dr. Maitland's “Dark Ages,” fifth edition, London, 1890, p. vi.



are middle, and then the joke ceases. *Dark* are they in so far as our straining sight cannot effectually pierce them. *Middle* are they only because of the self-sufficiency which will insist that we are the end. Final are we to none but ourselves; assuredly not to such as come after us. And the world will emerge from any slight deluge which follows our passing more easily than it arose when the water subsided from under the Ark."<sup>4</sup>

This is an effective bit of good-natured criticism. It is directed against those writers on mediæval subjects who refuse to project themselves into the atmosphere of the times they would reveal. There is another class, unhappily but too numerous, who persist in misrepresentation, owing to the opportunity thus given to write for the entertainment of prejudiced readers. Mr. Hone admits: "Respecting the multiform portion of this volume, denominated 'Illustrations,' I have to offer in excuse that there is enough for good-natured readers to find something to be amused with and nothing intended to offend those that I despair of pleasing. It is altogether skimble-skamble stuff, which, not aspiring to the character of an antiquarian treatise, may be allowed to deprecate antiquarian censure. There is little appearance of cohesion in the parts, and yet they scarcely require more than leisure to adapt and connect them according to the 'rules of the schools' with a few other particulars and make a book. The Boy Bishop, for instance, whose processions at Nicholas-tide, according to Strype, made the people so fond of keeping his holiday that every parish almost had its St. Nicholas, is associated with the Mysteries by the representations of these religious plays often taking place during his annual dignity. The *Feast of Fools*, and especially the *Feast of the Ass*, from their dramatic character and celebration as ecclesiastical performances, are equally admissible. To be sure, I have trespassed a little in the articles on the 'Council of the Trinity' and the 'Brethren of the Trinity, Aldersgate,' but who possessing a monkish legend in MS. or the chartulary of a dissolved fraternity could withstand the temptation of hitching into print a quotation or two on a colorable opportunity? In this, however, I acknowledge being influenced by liking rather than by judgment, and so in the article on the 'Descent Into Hell.' Reviewing my gossip on the word *aroint*, I confess that equity would compel me to dismiss it for impertinence. But it is printed, and its existence in these sheets is a lamentable proof of the fearful estate of him who mounts a hobby without a rein; though there is something like a shadow of excuse, too, for saying a little on old Hearn's plate as a Shakespearean authority."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> "The Origins of German Minnesang," *Mod. Philol.*, Vol. III., p. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Hone, "Ancient Mysteries Described," London, 1823, Preface, p. vi.

Such a frank avowal prepares one for almost every license, yet many writers have taken the account seriously and have exercised a remarkable ingenuity in weaving together this and similar "gossip" into a story exceptional and almost impossible, which they offer to an uninformed public as the true history of the later Middle Ages.

Perhaps the most noteworthy instances of this are to be had in such chapters as treat of mediæval realism, the motives of mediæval drama and the *Festa Stultorum et Asinorum*. These are important phases and deserve to be put forth in their true setting; for while they have been adapted to meet every exigency of press or platform, they have always retained the old imputations against the faith of the Middle Ages.

According to Warton, absolute realism was a feature of the mediæval stage. Commenting upon the garden scene, he says: "This extraordinary spectacle was beheld by a numerous assembly of both sexes with great composure. They had the authority of Scripture for such a representation, and they gave matters just as they found them in the third chapter of Genesis. It would have been absolute heresy to have departed from the sacred text in personating the primitive appearance of our first parents, whom the spectators so nearly resembled in simplicity."<sup>6</sup>

More recent scholars have taken quite a different view. "Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden," says Mr. Sidney M. Clark, "dressed in close-fitting coats of white leather and hose stained or dyed to (probably) a flesh color. At the proper time they put on over these 'fleshlings' rough garments of skin. 'Two cotes and a payre hosen for Eve stayned; a cote and hosen for Adam stayned.' The tradition that they appeared naked on the stage is quite unfounded, and it is hardly necessary to say that female characters were acted by men or boys."<sup>7</sup>

Mr. Chambers says: "Many writers have followed Warton in asserting that Adam and Eve were represented on the stage in actual nakedness. The statement is based upon a too literal interpretation of the stage directions of the Chester plays. There is a fine *a priori* improbability about it, and, as a matter of fact, there can be very little doubt that the parts were played as they would have been on any other stage in any other period of the world's history, except possibly at the Roman *Floralia*, in fleshlings. Jordan is quite explicit—Adam and Eve are to be 'aparlet in Whytt leather,' and, although Jordan's play is a late one, I think it may be taken for granted that white leather was sufficient to meet the exigencies even of mediæval realism."<sup>8</sup> Hastings has it: "When they were pre-

<sup>6</sup> Thomas Warton, "History of English Poetry," London, 1781, p. 162.

<sup>7</sup> Sidney M. Clark, "The Miracle Play in England," p. 676.

<sup>8</sup> E. K. Chambers, "The Mediæval Stage," Vol. II., p. 142.

sumed to be destitute of clothing, they appeared in dresses made either of white leather or of flesh-colored clothes, over which at the proper time were thrown the garments of skins."<sup>9</sup> The same opinion is expressed by the distinguished English scholar, Dr. Schelling, of the University of Pennsylvania: "The devils were ordinarily clothed in leather, which, being white of color, sufficiently served to represent the nakedness of our first parents in the Garden of Eden."<sup>10</sup>

There are still a few writers who follow Warton, but this is due to the need they feel for something to give color to the vague generalities which so easily flow from their pens. Thoughtful scholars know that it is never safe to judge a people by types which, had they been representatives of their class, would not have received the attention of contemporaneous critics. They know, too, that almost any theory may be supported by an appeal to incidents which were recorded mainly because they were so unusual, and that it is only in an honest assembling of everything which has come down to us respecting a far-away age that we may hope to arrive at even an approximate valuation of the social and moral condition of its people.

The disputed questions of Church history cannot now be passed over in silence without opening the way to the deserved charge of culpable remissness. Statements which have been disproved to the satisfaction of a numerous school of scholars are worth nothing unless supported by evidence. Moreover, the reader has a right to expect, if not an exposition of arguments for and against, at least some information respecting the origin and progress of the dispute.

Dr. Davidson, in his "English Mystery Plays," introduces his chapter on the "Doctrine of Transubstantiation as a Dramatic Motive" by a statement which promises more than the facts of ecclesiastical history will support. He says: "It becomes our next task to show the shifting standpoint within the liturgy which arose from the acceptance of a new theological dogma, to detect the introduction of a genuinely tragic moment, and to trace the growth of dogmatic expression within the Church service itself."<sup>11</sup>

That such a task demanded a wider treatment than that given by the writer is evident from the fact that there is nothing in the chapter to indicate that the author possessed more than an ordinary Protestant knowledge of either Catholic dogma or the facts of Church history. The question of dramatic motive did not demand more than to show that the doctrine of the Real Presence was accepted without question by the Universal Church throughout the period of

---

<sup>9</sup> Charles Hastings, "The Theatre," p. 141.

<sup>10</sup> Felix E. Schelling, "Elizabethan Drama," Vol. I., p. 25.

<sup>11</sup> Charles Davidson, "Studies in the English Mystery Plays," Transactions of the Conn. Acad., Vol. IX., p. 136 ff.



the English miracle play. Had Dr. Davidson confined his speculations within these limits, no objection could have been made, but, not content with what was undisputed, he goes further and takes for granted the precise point of discussion relative to the Real Presence, asserting without reservation that the doctrine was an innovation of the ninth century. In other words, that the treatise which Paschasius Radbertus sent to Charles the Bald was not an exposition of a universally accepted doctrine of the Church, but the formulation of a new one, which, strange to say, was at once received as apostolic teaching by the whole Christian world. It would seem that even a cursory examination of the writings of Radbertus would preclude any such conclusion. In his work on the Gospel of St. Matthew, after speaking of the Scripture proofs for the Real Presence, he expresses surprise that any one should deny the doctrine: "*Unde miror quid velint nunc quidam dicere, non in re esse veritatem carnis Christi vel sanguinis sed in sacramento virtutem carnis et non carnem, virtutem sanguinis et non sanguinem, figuram et non veritatem, umbram et non corpus cum hic species accipit veritatem et figuram, veterum hostiarum corpus.*"<sup>12</sup> In his "*Epistola ad Frudegardum*" he cites the fathers as witnesses, and concludes by appealing to the faith of the Church: "*Quid si quaeris, charissime, super quibus universaliter ab omnibus 'Amen' respondeatur in tota Ecclesia Christi, respice in sacramentorum celebratione instituyente beato Petro (ut credimus) quid orat Sacerdos in Canone exceptis his quae post communionem dicuntur. 'Ut fiat,' inquit, 'corpus et sanguis dilectissimi Filii tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi.'* Qua prece expleta, consona voce, omnes 'Amen' dicimus; sicque omnis Ecclesia in omni gente et lingua orat. Unde videat qui contra hoc venire voluerit magis quam credere, quid agat contra ipsum Dominum, et contra omnem Christi Ecclesiam."<sup>13</sup> What is particularly inexcusable in Davidson's chapter is the absence of anything which might serve to direct attention to the fact that many learned non-Catholic historians acknowledge the Real Presence to have been accepted from the earliest days of the Church. Grotius<sup>14</sup> says: "I find in all the liturgies, Greek, Latin, Arabic, Syriac and others, prayers to God that He would consecrate, by His Holy Spirit, the gifts offered, and make them the Body and the Blood of His Son. I was right, therefore, in saying that a custom so ancient and universal that it must be considered to have gone down from the primitive times ought not to have changed."

---

<sup>12</sup> Paschasius Radbertus, Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, Saeculum IX., p. 890: *Expositio in Matthaeum*, Lib. XII., Chap. XXVI.

<sup>13</sup> Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, Saec. IX., p. 1,363.

<sup>14</sup> *Votum pro Pace*.

Bishop Samuel Parker as early as 1678 admitted: "In the first place, then, it is evident to all men that are but ordinarily conversant in ecclesiastical learning that the ancient fathers, from age to age, asserted the *real* and *substantial* Presence in very high and expressive terms. The Greeks styled it *netabole*, *metarruthmis*, *metaskeuchismos*, *metapoiesis*, *metastoiceiosis*, and the Latins, agreeable with the Greeks, *Conversion*, *Transmutation*, *Transformation*, *Transfiguration*, *Transelementation* and, at length, *Transubstantiation*. By all which they expressed nothing more nor less than the real and substantial Presence in the Eucharist."<sup>15</sup> Dr. Adam Clarke quotes Justin Martyr as "in some measure asserting the transformation of the elements."<sup>16</sup>

The above citations are sufficient to indicate the limitations of what purports to be an accurate presentation of an important motive in early dramatic art.

Conspicuous among those who have made the *Festa Jocularia* yield chapter upon chapter of interesting anecdotes should be named Professor Gayley, of the University of California. His "Plays of Our Forefathers"<sup>17</sup> contains a chapter on the "Invasion of the Humorous," which, although not without foundation as regards many particulars, is in its general tone utterly misleading and untrustworthy. He has reconstructed a Church service for mediæval France, using freely and without question any account which might heighten the dramatic effect. The service began with Vespers, the cantor intoning: "Let no sour-faced person stay within the church: away on this day with envy and heartache: let all be cheerful who would celebrate the feast of the Ass." After Lauds preparations were made to introduce the ass into the church. "One may picture the pause," writes Professor Gayley, "the beast in his priestly trappings encircled by hilarious celebrants, the popping of corks and gurgling of wine, the toasting of 'my Lord the Ass,' the quaffing of deep draughts."

Certainly such a picture may be imagined. The question is, can it be safely taken as an honest representation of the religious mind of the Middle Ages? Is it fair to say that: "Thus the rustic folk while still continuing to kill their cattle and celebrate their solemnities as of yore might do so with a feasting that had become religious?"<sup>18</sup>

Mr. Gayley's treatment of the *Feast of Fools* is less reprehensible,

<sup>15</sup> Bishop Samuel Parker, "Reasons for Abrogating the Test Imposed Upon All Members of Parliament," London, 1688, p. 13.

<sup>16</sup> Dr. Adam Clarke, "A Concise View of the Succession of Sacred Literature," London, 1830, Vol. I, p. 97.

<sup>17</sup> Charles Mill Gayley, "Plays of Our Forefathers," p. 33 ff.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid*, p. 46.

for, although he follows Hone and Du Cange, he makes it plain that the custom when it exceeded all bounds of propriety was promptly condemned by ecclesiastical authority. He cites the expostulation made by the University of Paris against such abuses, and admits that it effected a slight reform—"one of a series of Augean purgations, none of which, however, dispensed with the need of one still newer and more Herculean."<sup>19</sup>

The "one still newer and more Herculean" is doubtless meant to suggest the revolt of Luther, but in the recent and more dispassionate histories of that period there is to be found little which will sustain the elaborate metaphor and much which will convict the writer of having slipped into the old fallacy of "*Post hoc, ergo propter hoc.*"

Quite different in temper is the account which Mr. Chambers gives in his work on the "Mediæval Stage." Speaking of the *Feast of Fools*, he says: "The ruling idea of the feast is the inversion of status, and the performance, inevitably burlesque, by the inferior clergy of functions properly belonging to their betters. . . . Much in all these proceedings was doubtless the merest horseplay; such ingenuity and humor as they required may have been provided by the wicked wit of the Galiardi. . . . The *Feast of Asses* has been the sport of controversialists who had not, and were at no great pains to have, the full facts before them."<sup>20</sup>

Dr. Maitland quotes Robertson's account of the feast, which recites in unmistakable terms that which modern writers are content to infer—namely, that "this ridiculous ceremony was not, like the festival of fools and some other pageants of those ages, a mere farcical entertainment exhibited in a church, and mingled, as was then the custom, with an imitation of some religious rites. It was an act of devotion performed by the ministers of religion and by the authority of the Church. However, as this practice did not prevail universally in the Catholic Church, its absurdity contributed at last to abolish it."<sup>21</sup>

Dr. Maitland declares the whole story a specimen of broad, bare-faced falsehood, and devotes a chapter to an examination of the matter. His comment upon Robertson's evident motive is worth quoting here, since it sheds light upon similar attempts to belittle the honest aims of Church discipline: "But having observed on the facts, let us now notice the animus and the modus. The facts are, as we have seen, absurdly misstated. But what are we to say of the design and the manner of introducing those facts? It is really

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 50.

<sup>20</sup> E. K. Chambers, "The Mediæval Stage," Vol. I, pp. 325-330.

<sup>21</sup> Maitland, "The Dark Ages," fifth edition, London, 1890, p. 169 ff.



necessary to say very little on this point, though it is principally for this that the matter is worth noticing at all. Who can help seeing the absurdity of introducing this asinine business by a sober reflection on the practical evils of assuming infallibility, with its attributes of perpetuity and immutability, and then telling us that what is apparently given as an example (for why else is it given at all?) never was general, and was, after a while, abandoned? But what is the obvious animus? Why did not Robertson, instead of throwing the whole odium of this nonsense on the Church, tell his readers that this ass was patronized by the people—that he was the pet of the laity—and that, with natural and characteristic obstinacy, and cheered by the love and sympathy of his lay friends, he kept his ground against the ecclesiastical powers which would have turned him out of the church? Why did he not add the statement of those from whom he borrowed the story—*‘Haec abolere censuris ecclesiasticis non semel tentarunt episcopi, sed frustra, altissimis quippe defixa erat radicibus donec supremi Senatus accessit auctoritas, qua tandem hoc festum suppressum est.’*”<sup>22</sup>

The study of the English cycles has not as yet passed beyond the point of special phase investigation. There is still much to be written before a comprehensive exposition of the whole subject can be hoped for. The constantly increasing interest in the long neglected field is sure to offer the multiplicity of views which will eventually make possible a satisfactory summing up of all into one harmonious story, wherein each event so often considered in extravagant detail will then be made to readjust itself to the strict confines of an accurate appraisalment.

It is with one of these phases not yet entered upon that the present monograph is concerned. The Blessed Virgin has been mentioned incidentally by many writers who treat of the English miracle plays. As usual, particular reference to the Virgin is often free from prejudice. It is only when mention is made of the general devotion given her that the mists of Protestant influence begin to creep in. Very often some exceptional incident recorded by old writers has been taken as mirroring the doctrine of the Church. Le Grand d’Aussy, pointing out the unfairness of judging an age by its legends, accounts for the practice when he says: “*Quelque écrivain, en par courant ces sortes d’ouvrages y rencontrera par hasard un passage, une anecdote, un prétendu fait historique, curieux à force de bêtise et de simplicité. Il le recueille et l’enchâsse dans quelqu’une de ses productions pour en rejouir ses lecteurs. Vient ensuite un compilateur d’anecdotes, un historien même qui frappé de la singularité du passage et croyant y voir l’esprit du Siècle ou il*

<sup>22</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 174-175.

fut écrit, s'en empare à son tour, et prononce après cela sur le siècle même. Combien d'exemples je pourrais citer en ce genre."<sup>23</sup>

A glance over a few of our foremost writers will convince one that the method alluded to by M. Le Grand d'Aussy is still common. Karl Mantzius, referring to the part the Blessed Virgin takes in the Miracles de Notre Dame, says: "This exaggerated belief in the omnipotent influence of the Virgin Mary, characteristic of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, finds its strongest expression in a speech in which the devil, who is always at war with the Mother of Christ, indicates the fear of our Lord to act against her will."<sup>24</sup> Professor Gayley expands the same idea into the following: "The Mariolatry of the eleventh century had, as Creizenach says, produced by the beginning of the twelfth a host of stories of the miraculous intervention of the Virgin on behalf of the afflicted who venerated her, or of the wanton lawless, or criminal who, repentant, placed themselves under her protection. By the end of the fourteenth century many of these stories, some indeed from the apocryphal gospels and the legends of the saints, but more from the mediæval *chansons des gestes, fabliaux* and romances familiar to common folk or country circle, had found their way into dramatic form and were presented before large audiences not only in Paris, but in various provincial cities, by the *Puys*, or semi-religious, associations of the several localities. Under color of the worship of the Virgin, these fraternities made their music, recited and sang their rondels of extravagant, but often exquisite, adoration and produced their miracles of the Mother of our Lord. In them she is helpless no longer, no longer broken-hearted or even pathetic, but victorious, majestic, magical and gracious—a vision of superhuman chastity and beauty; a fusion of faery queen and saint and goddess, as unconscious frequently as the first of a moral law, or as the second of a physical, or as the third of any kind of limitation in the performance of a superhuman desire."<sup>25</sup>

It will be noticed that the plays produced in France are made use of to support the charge of Mariolatry, and doubtless for the reason that, since the French nature differs so widely from the English, legends which would be understood in their proper light by Frenchmen might reasonably be expected to appear unpardonable to English taste.

But perhaps all is explained in the remark of Mr. Furnivall in his preface to "Hymns to the Virgin and Christ:" "After telling Mrs.

<sup>23</sup> Le Grand d'Aussy, "Fabliaux ou Contes," 3ième edition, Tôme Cinquième, Paris, 1829, Discours Preliminaire, p. 18.

<sup>24</sup> Karl Mantzius, "A History of Theatrical Art," trans. by Louise von Cassel, Vol. II., p. 17.

<sup>25</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 77.

Gaskell one day a story for the truth of which I could not vouch, she said, with a beautiful, bright smile: 'Now, I'm going to believe that whether it's true or not. It ought to be true.' On looking through the Lambeth MS., 853, which Mr. Stubbs kindly handed to me in Lambeth Palace Library, I could not help saying: 'I'll print it all, whether it contains early versions or late; it is a jolly little manuscript.'"<sup>26</sup>

It looks as if many writers hold the same view in regard to mediæval versions, whether early or late, but in copying them without some explanatory note they prevent their readers from forming a fair concept of the subject. After all has been worked over, with due regard to conditions, it may not be far from right to agree with Dr. Furnivall when he concludes: "And a survey of our early religious poetry will, I believe—and, so far as I may speak, from some work at it—result in a verdict favorable to the plain, good sense and practical going straight at the main point which Englishmen pride themselves on, whatever amount of Philistinism and humbug is mixed up with these qualities. The burden of the early songs (as I read them) is a prayer for forgiveness of sins, a desire to get out of the filth of the flesh and rise, as well here as hereafter, into the purer and higher life which, to the believer, union with his Saviour implied and implies."<sup>27</sup>

Not a few writers have made it appear that England's devotion to the Blessed Virgin, which is so beautifully portrayed in the play cycles, had its origin in the demand for a noble type of womanhood. Mr. Brewer, in an introduction to his "*Monumenta Franciscana*," attributes this to the preaching of the Franciscans, charging that devotion towards the Mother was urged even at the risk of lessening that which was due to her Son.<sup>28</sup> It is, then, a matter of considerable moment if one would study profitably the Blessed Virgin as presented in mediæval drama that at the outset a just estimate be formed of the place she has occupied in the religious life of the English people.

The "Book of Cerne," a Cambridge manuscript, which was in the possession of Ethelwald during the latter part of the eighth century, contains a prayer to the Blessed Virgin in which she is saluted as "Mother of God, forever blessed, glorious, chaste and pure—Mary without stain, chosen and loved of God and advocate of sinners."<sup>29</sup> The Council of Hatfield, which was held in 680, gave faithful assent to the Lateran decrees containing the explicit teaching of the Church

<sup>26</sup> Furnivall, "Hymns to the Virgin and Christ," *Early English Text Society*, No. 24, 1867.

<sup>27</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>28</sup> J. S. Brewer, "*Monumenta Franciscana*," Vol. I., *Rolls Series*.

<sup>29</sup> *Home and Foreign Review*, October, 1862, p. 481.



respecting the Blessed Virgin's maternity and virginity. The writings of the Venerable Bede are replete with doctrinal and devotional passages in reference to the Virgin, which indicate how universally the prerogatives of the Virgin Mother were acknowledged in the land of the Saxons.

That no doubt may remain of the antiquity of the devotion to the Blessed Virgin in England, it may be well to quote somewhat extensively from the earliest Anglo-Saxon writers. Caedmon's "Fall of Man" thus alludes to the redemption:

When the Serpent our Preserver spoke,  
The Lord Almighty to the varied snake,  
Far journeying, and in words He thus decreed:  
Thou shalt, accursed, with thy belly tread  
All thy life long the earth; upon thy breast  
Go footless, while the life to thee shall rest,  
The spirit within thee; all thy life's days long.  
Dust shalt thou eat as thou hast caused the wrong.  
Thee shall the Woman hate, and thine own head  
At war with thee, beneath her feet shall tread;  
Thou shalt her heel beset and war shall be,  
And fatal hate, betwixt her seed and thee,  
While the world standeth the wide heav'ns below;  
How thou shalt live now, fell destroyer, know.<sup>80</sup>

The *Codex Exoniensis*, as published by Thorpe in 1842, contains the tribute of Cynewulf to the Virgin. Thorpe considered it of philological interest only. The poem has found a more appreciative interpreter in Mr. Gollancz, and it is from his translation that the following is taken:

Young was the maiden,  
A damsel sinless, whom He chose as mother.  
It came to pass without the love of man,  
That the bride was great by child-conception.  
Never before or after in the world  
Was any meed of woman like to that;  
It was a secret mystery of the Lord.

O sight of peace! Holy Jerusalem!  
Choicest of royal thrones! Citadel of Christ!  
The native seat of angels and of the just,  
The souls of whom alone rest in thee ever,  
Exulting in glory. No sign of aught unclean  
Shall ever be beheld in that abode,  
But every sin shall flee afar from thee,  
All curse and conflict; thou art gloriously full  
Of holy promise, e'en as thou art named.  
See now thyself how all the wide creation  
And heaven's roof surveyeth thee about,  
On every side, and how the King of heaven  
Seeketh thee in His course, and cometh Himself,  
And taketh His dwelling in thee, as in days of yore  
Soothsayers so wise declared in words;  
They made known Christ's birth; they told it for thy comfort,  
Thou best of cities!

## II.

O sovran Lady of the blissful skies,  
Thou noblest maid through all the realms of earth,  
That the ocean-dwellers have ever heard tell of,  
Unfold the mystery that came to thee from heaven,

<sup>80</sup> Caedmon, "The Fall of Man, or, Paradise Lost," ed. by William H. F. Bosanquet, London, 1860.

How thou didst in some wise receive increase  
 By child-conception, and yet thou knewest not  
 Communion after human fashion.  
 Truly we have not heard that ever yet,  
 In days of yore, the like hath come to pass,  
 Such as thou in special grace receivedst,  
 Nor may we hope that it will ever chance  
 In future time. Lo, the faith that dwelt in thee  
 Was worshipful, since thou didst in thy bosom bear  
 The flower of glory, and thy great maidenhood  
 Was not destroyed. All the children of men  
 As they sow in sorrow, so afterwards they reap,  
 They bring forth for death.

The Blessed Virgin now answers, saying that the mystery, although unknown to men, was revealed to her, the kinswoman of royal David, and then, having sung of the Nativity, the poet turns to Mary with an apostrophe remarkable for strength and imagery:

Hail, thou glory of this middle-world,  
 Thou purest woman throughout all the earth,  
 Of those that were from immemorial time,  
 How rightly art thou named by all endowed  
 With gift of speech! All mortals throughout earth  
 Declare, full blithe of heart, that thou art bride  
 Of Him that ruleth the empyreal sphere.  
 So, too, the highest in the heavens above,  
 The thanes of Christ, proclaim aloud and sing,  
 That thou by might of holiness art queen  
 Of the hosts of glory, of the ranks of men  
 On earth 'neath heaven, and of hell's habitants,  
 For thou alone of all the race of men  
 With noble aspiration didst resolve  
 To bring thy maidenhood unto the Lord,  
 To offer it in all thy sinlessness.  
 No ring-adorned bride like unto thee  
 Hath ever come again 'mong humankind,  
 To send with spirit pure the glorious gift  
 Unto the heavenly home. Wherefore the Lord triumphant  
 Bade His chief messenger fly hitherward  
 From His great glory, and anon to thee  
 Reveal His might's avail, that thou shouldst bear  
 In purity the Son of the Supreme,  
 In mercy to mankind, and nathless, Mary,  
 Thou shouldst be held immaculate for aye.  
 Eke have we heard the words that long ago  
 The prophet truly spake concerning thee,  
 In distant days of old, to wit, Isaiah,  
 That he was led where he beheld aright  
 Life's dwelling-place in the eternal home;  
 Looked then the wise soothsayer o'er all the land,  
 Till that he saw where stood immovable  
 A glorious portal; bound all about  
 With precious metal was the door immense,  
 Begirt with wondrous bands; he pondered much  
 How any mortal man might e'er avail  
 To lift the bolts and bars so firmly fixed,  
 Yea, ever unto all eternity,  
 Or ope the fastening of that city-gate,  
 Until God's angel joyfully to him  
 Disclosed how it would be, and spake these words:  
 "I may tell thee"—truly it came to pass—  
 "That God Himself, Father Omnipotent,  
 In future time, yea, by His Spirit's might,  
 Will glorify these golden gates withal,  
 And through these firm-set bolts will visit earth,  
 And after Him shall they remain for aye,  
 To all eternity, so firmly closed,  
 That no one else but He, the Saviour God,  
 Shall e'er avail to open them again."  
 Now is the thing fulfilled that at that time  
 The sage there with his eyes contemplated.

Thou art the wall-door; through thee the Omnipotent,  
The Ruler, once proceeded to this earth;  
And as He, Christ Almighty, found thee then  
Adorned with all thy virtues, pure and choice,  
So He, the Prince of Angels, Lord of life,  
Closed thee, immaculate e'en as of yore,  
After Him again, as with a wondrous key.  
Show us now the grace that God's own messenger,  
The angel Gabriel, brought unto thee!  
Forsooth we dwellers in earth's cities pray,  
That thou reveal their comfort unto men,  
Thy very Son. Hereafter we may all,  
With one accord, look forward hopefully,  
If now we see the Child upon thy breast.  
Plead thou our cause for us with earnest words,  
That He may suffer us no longer here  
To list to Error in this vale of death,  
But that He lead us to the Father's realm,  
Where sorrowless we may forever more  
Abide in glory with the Lord of Hosts.<sup>31</sup>

Caedmon and Cynewulf sang their praise of the Blessed Virgin because their hearts were filled with devotion. That their song was a welcome one to the faith of their countrymen is evident in the frequent mention of the Blessed Virgin in the monuments of the period. We read in the "*Historia Nennii*" that King Arthur triumphed over the Saxons by the favor of the Blessed Virgin. He carried her image upon his shoulders, and upon that day the pagans were put to flight.<sup>32</sup>

The monastic chronicles, although written later, bear abundant testimony to the widespread devotion given to Mary in England. It cannot be fairly maintained that the numerous references to the honor paid the Virgin Mary are interpolations. Such a supposition impeaches the good faith of men who in all probability had at their own disposal the cherished historical data of ages.

This is pointed out and made much of by Mr. Stevenson in the preface to his "*Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*." He says: "As there existed no antecedent inducement to deal unfairly with the truth, so there is no internal evidence that the truth has been unfairly dealt withal. The compilers of this narrative, whoever they may have been, executed their labor with commendable singleness of purpose. Their intention was to record the history of their own monastery, and to that object they have religiously confined themselves. Guiltless of any attempt to produce effect and devoid of all artistic skill, they have told what they had to tell like unpracticed writers, but like honest men, dully but truthfully."<sup>33</sup>

Sufficient has now been said to indicate in a general way the vantage ground one should occupy before attempting to single out a particular feature of the mediæval drama for special study. With

<sup>31</sup> Israel Gollancz, "*Cynewulf's Christ*," London, 1892.

<sup>32</sup> "*Monumenta Historica Britannica*," edited by Henry Petrie and John Sharpe, Vol. I, pp. 51 and 73.

<sup>33</sup> Rolls Series, 1858, Vol. I, p. 4.



the charge of immoral stage representation disproved, the one-sided view of Protestant writers regarding questions of ecclesiastical history indicated, and a brief survey of England's early devotion to the Mother of God concluded, a further and more particular inquiry may now be entered upon.

The Blessed Virgin in the York cycle of miracle plays is introduced in the fourfold character of maiden, mother, wife and advocate. With her Divine Son, she receives the most reverential treatment. The primary object of her presentation is a religious one. As the lowly handmaid of the redemption, she is the model of Christian humility and obedience; as the Mother of God, she is raised in dignity above men and angels; as the wife of St. Joseph, she is the embodiment of all the virtues of the home; as an advocate, she is the kind-hearted friend of the fallen. The history of her life followed step by step from Nazareth to the quiet home of the Beloved Disciple, where she joyfully waited for death and the assumption of her body into heaven, is lacking in nothing which dramatic art demands. With what success the writers of the York cycle employed this richness of material will appear as their plays unfold the story of her joys, her sorrows and her glories.

While the plays were made sufficiently entertaining to attract and hold the attention of the people, they had as a main purpose the teaching of religious truths and the inculcation of sound moral principles. This may be seen in the following proclamation of the York City Council relative to the annual presentation of the cycle:

*"In the name of God, Amen.* Whereas for a long course of time the artificers and tradesmen of the city of *York* have, at their own expense, acted plays, and particularly a certain sumptuous play, exhibited in several pageants, wherein the history of the old and new testament in divers places of the said city, in the feast of *Corpus Christi* by a solemn procession, is represented in reverence to the sacrament of the body of Christ. Beginning first at the great gates of the priory of the holy *Trinity* in *York*, and so going in procession to and into the cathedral church of the same, and afterwards to the hospital of *St. Leonard* in *York*, leaving the aforesaid sacrament in that place. Preceded by a vast number of lighted torches and a great multitude of priests in their proper habits, and followed by the mayor and citizens, with a prodigious crowd of the populace attending. And whereas, upon this a certain very religious father, *William Melton*, of the order of the *friars minor*, professor of holy pageantry and a most famous preacher of the word of God, coming to this city, in several sermons recommended the aforesaid play to the people, affirming that it was good in itself and very commendable so to do. Yet also said that the citizens of the said city and other

foreigners coming to the said feast had greatly disgraced the play by revellings, drunkenness, shouts, songs and other insolencies, little regarding the divine office of the said day. And what is to be lamented, they lose for that reason the indulgences by the Holy Father Pope Urban IV., in this part gratuitously conceded. Those, viz., faithful in *Christ*, who attended at morning service at the said feast in the church where it was celebrated, an hundred days; those at Mass the same; those also who came to the first vespers of the said feast, the like an hundred days; the same in the second; to those also who even at the first, third, sixth and ninth complectory offices, for every hour of those forty days; to those also who attended service on the octave of the said feast at matins or vespers, Mass or the aforesaid hours, an hundred days for every day of the said octave; as in the holy canons, for this end made, is more fully contained; and therefore, as it seemed most wholesome to the said father *William*, the people of the city were inclined that the play should be played on one day and the procession on another, so that the people might attend divine service at the churches on the said feast for the indulgences aforesaid. . . ."<sup>34</sup>

It is worthy of notice that special commendation is accorded the Franciscan friar, William Melton. Modern scholars have pointed out that Drake's "professor of holy pageantry" is a mistranslation of the original title, *Professor Paginae Sacrae*. However, Dr. Gayley retains Drake's translation. Referring to a critic of his who had said: "The York friar, William Melton, still passes as a 'professor of holy pageantry,' although the *sacra pagina* of which he was professor cannot possibly be anything but 'Holy Writ,'"<sup>35</sup> Dr. Gayley refuses to retract, and recommits himself to the surmise that Father Melton was a playwright, at least by avocation. Miss Lucy Toulmin Smith says that his desire to have all attend Mass on the feast of *Corpus Christi* was probably inspired by the hope of selling indulgences.<sup>36</sup> The charge is a gratuitous one and wholly unsupported by evidence either direct or indirect. Mr. Arthur F. Leach might have made the statement by the force of hypothesis, since in his eyes to search for virtue among friars is a hopeless task.<sup>37</sup>

FRANCIS O'NEILL, O. P.

Washington, D. C.

<sup>34</sup> Francis Drake, "History of York," 1736, two vols. See appendix, p. xxix.

<sup>35</sup> *Athenaeum*, August 1, 1903.

<sup>36</sup> "York Mystery Plays, Introd., p. xxxiv.

<sup>37</sup> "York Mystery Plays," Introd., p. xxxiv.

## PIUS VII. AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.—VI.

THE occupation of Rome by the troops of General Miollis on February 2, 1808, did not bring the rule of Pius VII. to an end at once. It was but the continuation of the many aggressions by which, without a declaration of war, Napoleon had gradually deprived the Holy Father of his chief fortresses and his richest provinces. Ancona had been occupied in October, 1805, under pretext of defending it against the English; the port and citadel of Cività Vecchia were taken in June, 1806; the Duchies of Beneventum and Pontecorvo were at the same time declared to be fiefs of the Empire and granted to Talleyrand and Bernadotte, and in October, 1807, General Lemarois was ordered to take possession of the provinces of Urbino, Ancona, Macerata and Fermo. What rendered this method of destroying the temporal power of Pius VII., by successive annexations of his territories, still more odious was that the Holy See and the French Empire were supposed to be at peace, and that negotiations were being carried on at Paris by the Papal representative to induce the Emperor to desist from demanding concessions which the Holy Father's conscience would not allow him to grant. The most important of these were the closure of the ports of the Papal States to the ships of England and Russia and the occupation of their fortresses by French troops whenever a foreign army had landed or was about to land in Italy. If the Pope consented to these proposals, which would reduce him to the position of a vassal, the Emperor declared that he would be satisfied, and that the Pope might reckon on the preservation of his States.<sup>1</sup> Napoleon sought to terrify the Holy Father by the violence of the language which he addressed to his Legate. In one of his habitual outbursts of fury he told Cardinal Caprara, in presence of all his court,<sup>2</sup> to inform the Pope that, if his demands were not immediately complied with, he would seize all that remained of the Papal States. He would divide them into duchies and principalities like Benevento and Pontecorvo, and would distribute them as he pleased. It was useless to make any observation, he added, as he had made up his mind, and he would not change it. The fate of Rome would depend on the answer.

These threats, however, failed to induce Pius VII. to depart from the neutrality which he considered that he was bound to observe, and his resolution was approved of by the Cardinals to whom the

<sup>1</sup> P. Ilario Rinieri, *Napoleone e Pio VII. (1804-1813). Relazioni storiche su documenti inediti del Archivio Vaticano-Torino*, 1906, p. 296.

<sup>2</sup> At an audience at St. Cloud on July 1, 1806.



Legate's report was communicated. Cardinal Caprara was, therefore, ordered to leave Paris and return to Rome in case the Emperor were to proceed to carry out his threats, or, if unable to do so, to cease from exercising his functions as Legate.

The Emperor's absence from Paris for the campaign against Prussia suspended the discussion of the question for some time, but when, after the victories of Auerstadt and Jena, he had entered Berlin (28th October, 1806), he sent for Mgr. Arezzo, who had been Papal Nuncio at St. Petersburg and was then living in Dresden. He repeated to him on November 12, 1806, for the purpose of being communicated to the Holy Father, the same demands and the same threats which had been already addressed to Cardinal Caprara. He informed him, moreover, that Italy belonged to him by right of conquest, and that he had inherited the rights of Charlemagne. He then boasted of the services he had rendered to religion, and denied that he wished to introduce the *Code Napoléon* into Rome. He assured him that he reduced all his demands to the single condition of closing the ports to the English, and he asked that a negotiator should be sent to Paris provided with full powers to bring about a settlement of the question. If it were refused, he would take away the temporal power of the Holy See, place a King or a Senator in Rome, divide the Papal States into a number of duchies and give the Pope a pension which should enable him to maintain his position with dignity.

Mgr. Arezzo's mission did not achieve more success than Napoleon's previous attempts to render the Holy Father the instrument of his ambition. Pius VII. could only express his surprise that, when he had on so many occasions given the reasons which forbade him to yield to the Emperor's demands, he should now be expected to return a different answer. The duties appertaining to his office and his character of Father and Pastor did not allow him to join any federation or to take part in hostilities against any nation which included Catholics. As to the fatal consequences and the loss of his States which might be the result of his refusal, he regretted that such considerations should have been thought capable of turning him aside from his duties. He had placed his cause in the hands of God, and trusting in the Divine protection, he would await with calm and resignation whatever might be written in the decrees of Providence.<sup>3</sup> There was also another reason why he should not enter into further negotiations. When the Emperor met Mgr. Arezzo at Berlin he had asked that an envoy should be sent to Paris

---

<sup>3</sup> Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 312. Mgr. Arezzo's report and the letter sent by the Papal government to the Nuncios, with a copy of the reply returned to Talleyrand.

to discuss his various demands, but Pius VII. saw the snare which was being prepared for him, and refused to comply. His envoy on reaching Paris would have been requested to meet the Emperor at Berlin or Warsaw, and would thereby have given rise to a false impression, which it was Napoleon's interest to create, that the Holy Father was taking part with him against the powers at war with France, towards whom, on the contrary, Pius VII. was resolved to observe absolute neutrality.<sup>4</sup>

Other circumstances contributed about the same time to increase the irritation which the Holy Father's steadfast resistance had caused the Emperor. An Italian Concordat between the Holy See and the Cisalpine Republic was signed on September 16, 1803. It was published on January 26, 1804, and Count Melzi, the Vice President of the republic, added to it by a decree organic articles similar to those added to the French Concordat, but fewer in number, which were much at variance with it and modified its action considerably. Thus only those orders which were employed in teaching or minding the sick or were engaged in similar duties of public utility were allowed to receive novices. To enter a religious community or to receive holy orders the consent of the government was necessary, and without its permission no bulls, briefs or rescripts of the Court of Rome could be published.<sup>5</sup>

To the protestations of Pius VII. against such an infraction of a solemn treaty, the First Consul, who was then engaged in making preparations for the invasion of England, replied by vague promises that, together with Cardinal Caprara, he would regulate everything concerning the Italian Concordat, but nothing was done. He did not blame Melzi or disapprove of the decree which had probably been published with his consent.<sup>6</sup> The Concordat was thus allowed to remain in abeyance for more than a year, but when, in 1805, Napoleon had crowned himself King of Italy at Milan, he ordered, by a decree of May 22, that the Concordat should be put in execution on the 1st of June following. He then proceeded to enact several measures with regard to the ecclesiastical affairs of the Italian kingdom, which, according to the terms of the Concordat, required the concurrence of the Holy See. By his decree of June 8 he repaired, it is true, in a great measure the injury which had been inflicted on the Church in North Italy by the revolutionary movements of 1796 and the succeeding years; for he assigned revenues to the archbishoprics and bishoprics, to the chapters and the seminaries of the kingdom, restoring to them a large part of their former incomes. But these endow-

<sup>4</sup> Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 313.

<sup>5</sup> Padre Ilario Rinieri, *La Diplomazia Pontificia nel Secolo XIX.* Roma, 1902, t. II., p. 209.

<sup>6</sup> Rinieri, *Diplomazia*, t. II., p. 215.

ments should have been made by agreement with the Holy See, and not purely by his sole will and authority. Moreover, he did not revoke Count Melzi's organic articles, but, acting in the same spirit, he decreed that the religious orders of men and women which were engaged in teaching or in caring for the sick should be preserved; he regulated the number of convents which the other orders might still retain and the amount of the pensions to be given to their inmates; he fixed the age for taking religious vows at 21 for men and 18 for women, and he handed over to the State to be sold for the purpose of extinguishing the national debt the property of the convents and monasteries which were suppressed. By another decree, dated June 22, 1805, he reduced the number of parishes, which he considered to be too large in certain towns, by uniting several in one.<sup>7</sup>

Pius VII. protested against these decrees, issued in defiance of the terms of the Concordat, as well as against the introduction into Italy of the *Code Napoléon*, which authorized divorce, and the Emperor yielded so far as to instruct Cardinal Fesch, his representative in Rome, to discuss the matter with whoever the Pope should name for that purpose. Cardinal Antonelli was entrusted with the negotiation on the part of the Holy See, but before any understanding could be reached Napoleon grew impatient. He was not accustomed to tolerate any opposition to his will or to recede from any position he had taken up, and he therefore directed Talleyrand to inform Cardinal Fesch that he did not wish the discussion to be continued, and did not even wish to hear it mentioned again.<sup>8</sup>

When, therefore, in September, 1806, the Holy Father was requested to grant the canonical institution to ten Bishops who had been nominated by the Emperor to sees in the kingdom of Italy, he at first declined and replied that as long as the infractions of the Concordat, of which he had so often complained, were allowed to subsist, he could not consider himself to be bound by an agreement which the Emperor on his side had ceased to observe. The negotiations, too, which had been begun for the purpose of settling these difficulties and coming to an understanding on the subject, were still far from being concluded. The Pope consented, however, to accept the nominations, provided that these prelates possessed the necessary qualifications, but in his letter to Prince Eugène Beauharnais, Viceroy of the Kingdom of Italy, he told him frankly that he hoped that he should not be exposed to the painful necessity of making a

<sup>7</sup> Cesare Cantù, *Corrispondenza di diplomatici della Repubblica e del Regno d'Italia (1796-1814)*. Milano, 1884, p. 320. Instructions données à M. di Birago, ministre plénipotentiaire du Royaume d'Italie auprès du Saint Siège. P. Rinieri, *Diplomazia*, t. II., p. 221. Cardinal Consalvi's note to Cardinal Fesch, 30 July, 1805.

<sup>8</sup> Cantù, *op. cit.*, p. 321.



public declaration to the Church so as to clear himself from the reproach of having remained silent too long, since he perceived that it had been of no use and might be a cause of scandal to the faithful.<sup>9</sup>

These words clearly alluded to the many acts of violence both with regard to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Holy See and to its territorial possessions, of which the Emperor had been guilty, and that in consequence the Sovereign Pontiff might denounce him to all Christendom as having incurred the censures of the Church. Prince Eugène forwarded the letter to Napoleon. It was just after his interview at Tilsit with the Emperor of Russia and the King of Prussia and the signature of the treaty between the three monarchs (July 7, 1807). With the exception of England, whose fleets held the seas and blockaded his ports, all Europe lay prostrate at his feet; the great military powers of the Continent had been crushed, and the thought that the ruler of what little still remained of a feeble and unwarlike State should dare not only to resist his will, but to reprove his actions, drove him to fury.

In his reply to Prince Eugène, a long letter which he ordered him to forward to Pius VII., he poured forth a torrent of insults and calumnious accusations against the Holy Father and the Sacred College. He declared that if the Pope were to denounce him to Christendom he would no longer look upon him as Pope, but as anti-Christ, and would prevent all communication between his subjects and Rome. He accused the Court of Rome of inciting the Italians to rebel against him. "What does Pius VII. intend to do by denouncing me? Will he place my thrones under an interdict and excommunicate me? Does he think that the weapons will fall from the hands of my soldiers?<sup>10</sup> And will he put the poignard into the hands of my subjects to assassinate me? . . . There is so much folly in all this that I can only groan over this spirit of madness which has seized two or three Cardinals who manage affairs in Rome." He then went on to attack the temporal power of the Papacy and to revile the authorities in Rome for their blindness,

<sup>9</sup> Rinieri, *Napoleone e Pio VII.*, p. 323.

<sup>10</sup> Napoleon's insolent question was answered during the disastrous Russian campaign, of which Count de Ségur, one of the Emperor's aides-de-camp, has left a vivid description. This is what he witnessed during the retreat from Moscow: "Everything, even their weapons—which at Malo Jarostavetz were still available for offense, but which since then were merely defensive—then turned against them. They seemed an intolerable weight to their benumbed arms. They escaped from their hands in their frequent falls; they were broken or were lost in the snow. If the soldiers rose again, it was without them; for they did not fling them away: hunger and cold tore them away. The fingers of many men who still held their muskets froze upon them, for they impeded the movement which was wanted to keep up what warmth and life still remained there."—*Mémoires du Général Comte de Ségur*, Paris, 1894, t. II., p. 256.

since they failed to see that it was he who had reëstablished religion in Italy. He accused the Court of Rome of neglecting the interests of religion and seeking to acquire arbitrary power, and he threatened that if this disturbance of the affairs of his Empire were to continue, the time was perhaps not very far off when he would acknowledge the Pope only as Bishop of Rome and as of equal rank with the other Bishops of his dominions. He would not fear to unite the Churches of France, Italy, Germany and Poland in a council and transact his business without the Pope. He declared that he would not accept the decisions of the Consistory until the Sacred College should be composed of French, German, Spanish and Italian Cardinals in a number proportionate to the population of each of these States. Finally, he refused to make a second Italian Concordat for Venice, Piedmont and Parma or to allow his Bishops to go to Rome to submit themselves to a foreign sovereign in a city that was filled with his enemies.

To this wild and incoherent torrent of invectives Prince Eugène added a commentary, apparently in his own name, but which also formed part of the letter he had received from the Emperor. He, too, accused the Cardinals of ruining the Church, and warned the Pope that a new schism was about to take place, which should free France, Italy, Naples and the Confederation of the Rhine from the influence of the Court of Rome and leave the Pope isolated. He praised the services which the Emperor had rendered to religion—services “that were without example in the annals of the world,” and called Napoleon a monarch “who could be compared only to Cyrus and Charlemagne.” He ended by informing the Holy Father that it was the last time that he had leave to write to him; that he might name Bishops or not, as he pleased, but that any one who should preach insurrection should be punished by the law, the power of which is also derived from on high.<sup>11</sup>

Pius VII. in his reply did not condescend to take any notice of the insulting language contained in this letter; of the false accusations he merely said that they had been often refuted and did not require to be again refuted. With regard to the threatened schism, he pointed out to the Prince that the Church could reckon on assistance which was above all human power, and he assured him that he would perform his sacred duties in perfect tranquillity and would not allow himself to be guided by any fear.<sup>12</sup>

Shortly after the reception of this letter M. Alquier, the French

---

<sup>11</sup> Correspondance de Napoléon I. publiée par ordre de Napoléon III. Paris, 1858-1864, t. XV., No. 12,942. Au Prince Eugène. Dresde, 22 Juillet, 1807.

<sup>12</sup> Rinieri, Napoleone e Pio VII., p. 331.

Ambassador in Rome, requested Pius VII. to give Cardinal Caprara full powers to discuss the questions pending between the Holy See and the Empire, and seek to bring about an understanding between the two powers. The Pope, however, who knew how much his Legate was under the influence of the Emperor, thought that it would be more prudent to send Cardinal Litta, a member of a Milanese family, as special envoy, but the Emperor considered him to be hostile to France and declined to receive him. At the same time he accused the Court of Rome of being animated with a spirit of malevolence, and declared that in order to assure the safety of his army at Naples he would seize three more provinces of the Papal States unless the Pope consented to expel from Rome all strangers and all the enemies of France.<sup>13</sup>

The Emperor then expressed the wish that Cardinal de Bayane, a French subject, should be named envoy. The Holy Father hastened to comply with the request, but Prince Eugène received orders from Paris to detain the Cardinal at Milan while on his way unless he were able to give a solemn assurance that he had received full powers to settle all the questions with regard to which Rome and the Emperor were at issue. Alquier, too, was instructed to ask the Papal Government firstly if the Cardinal had been authorized to consent that the Holy Father should "enter the political system of France against the English and the infidels;" secondly, if he had the power to make any concessions with regard to the ecclesiastical affairs of Italy, such as the suppression of the religious orders, the dispensation of the Italian Bishops from coming to Rome to be consecrated and the extension of the Italian Concordat to the Venetian provinces as well as the other conquered territories. If these conditions were refused, Alquier had orders to quit Rome at once with all the French embassy and the legations of Urbino, Macerata and Ancona should be seized.

The Holy Father's reply was given on the same day. Full powers had been given to Cardinal de Bayane to come to an understanding and to make stipulations with regard to the first of these demands as well as to those concerning the consecration in Rome of the Italian Bishops and the extension of the Italian Concordat to the other States, but not as to the religious orders, since that subject had not been previously mentioned.<sup>14</sup> From the correspondence of Cardinal Casoni, the Minister of State, with de Bayane and Alquier, quoted by Padre Rinieri, it is evident that Pius VII., in consenting at last to close the ports of his States against the English, had made a very

---

<sup>13</sup> Correspondance de Napoléon I., t. XV., No. 13,045. A. M. de Champagny, *Ministre des relations extérieures*. Paris, 18 Août, 1807.

<sup>14</sup> Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 351.



unimportant concession; for they were since some time occupied by the French and were no longer in his power. But he positively refused to bind himself to enter into any federation or to contract any obligation to consider the friends and enemies of France as his friends and enemies. That would lead him into a war and would be incompatible with the independence of the Holy See. Cardinal ed Bayane was therefore instructed to discuss this demand and make stipulations concerning it in order that the Emperor's intentions should be clearly defined; for if anything more than the closure of the ports were demanded, the Pope declared that he should be unable to ratify the treaty.<sup>15</sup>

When Cardinal de Bayane arrived at Fontainebleau on October 30, he found that the Emperor showed no desire to receive him immediately. Napoleon, in fact, had already decided on the course he intended to follow, and de Champagny, his Minister for Foreign Affairs, told the Cardinal that it was a matter of indifference to the Emperor whether his demands were granted or not, as he had made up his mind. Whatever, indeed, may have been the motive which impelled him to seek to negotiate with the Holy Father, it is certain that preparations had already been made for the annexation of three Papal provinces. He had written to Prince Eugène on September 25 to send General Duhesme's division from Cività Vecchia to Ancona and to form there an army destined to take possession of the provinces of Urbino, Macerata, Fermo and Spoleto, in order to assure his communications with the Kingdom of Naples. He added that all these French troops quartered in the Papal States were to be fed, clothed and paid by the Pope, which he thought that the Prince would find to be a very great economy.<sup>16</sup> Even while Cardinal de Bayane was on his way to Paris the Emperor sent General Lemarois to Prince Eugène to be invested by him with the command of all the troops, both Papal and French, quartered in those provinces, so that as soon as he got the order he might take possession of them, seize their revenues and establish a provisional administration.<sup>17</sup> By subsequent despatches Prince Eugène was instructed to order the general to employ the Papal troops in suppressing brigandage and to arrest any of the Papal Governors or

<sup>15</sup> Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 356. Cardinal Casoni's letter to the Papal Nuncios, 15 October, 1807.

<sup>16</sup> Correspondance, t. XVI., No. 13,182. A Eugène Napoléon, Vice-roi d'Italie. Fontainebleau, 25 Septembre, 1807. "Ce qui ne laissera pas que de faire une assez grande économie."

<sup>17</sup> Correspondance, t. XVI., No. 13,210. A Eugène Napoléon. Fontainebleau, 3 Octobre, 1807. The decree which named Lemarois governor general was dated October 14, but is not to be found in the Correspondance. It is mentioned in a letter from Mgr. Vidoni, Governor of Ancona. Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 360.

agents who refused to submit to his authority. Another letter of November 23 informed the Prince that the Papal representatives were still nominally the administrators of the country, but that General Lemarois was to have the command of the troops and of the police. The general had, indeed, already begun to make use of the powers conferred on him. He soon found that the functionaries named by the Holy See refused to obey any orders except those issued by the Pope, and being unable to overcome their resistance he caused several of them to be arrested, among others Mgr. Pandolfi, Governor of Ascoli, and Mgr. Rivarola, Governor of Macerata, the latter of whom he imprisoned in the fortress of Pesaro.

Although in his interview with Mgr. Arezzo Napoleon had assured him that the only concession he would demand from the Pope was the closure of the ports of his States to English shipping, the draft of a much more extensive treaty, consisting of ten articles, was presented to Mgr. de Bayane on his arrival in Paris and was sent by him to Pius VII. By the terms proposed in this agreement the naval and military forces of the Sovereign Pontiff were to be united to those of the Emperor. In every war against the English the ports of the Papal States were to be closed to their warships and to their commerce, and the guard of the ports of Ancona, Ostia and Cività Vecchia was to be confided to the Emperor's troops. The fortress of Ancona was to have a garrison of 2,000 men, to be maintained by the Holy See, but the other French garrisons in the Papal States were to be maintained by the Emperor. His Holiness was to acknowledge their Majesties Joseph Napoleon, King of Naples; Louis Napoleon, King of Holland, and Jerome Napoleon, King of Westphalia, as well as the Grand Duke of Berg (Murat), the Princes of Lucca and Piombino and all the changes which had been made in Germany and Italy. The Pope should also renounce all his claims opposed to the rights of the King of Naples as well as his sovereignty over Benevento and Pontecorvo, now made fiefs of the Empire. The number of the Cardinals belonging to the French Empire was to be raised to one-third of the entire number of the Sacred College. The Concordat made with the Kingdom of Italy was to be extended to the various other States annexed to it as well as to the principalities of Lucca and Piombino, and no Bishop of the Kingdom of Italy was to be obliged to go to Rome to receive consecration. A Concordat was to be made without delay between the Holy See and His Majesty for the German States which form the Confederation of the Rhine.<sup>18</sup>

The Cardinals then present in Rome, to the number of over thirty, were again consulted by the Pope as to whether he could accept such

---

<sup>18</sup> Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 370.

conditions, and if not, what course he should pursue. Of their answers, given in writing, no trace can be found, with the exception of the draft of that of Cardinal di Pietro, who pointed out the unjust and insidious character of the Emperor's proposals, the snares which they contained and the dangers to which their acceptance would lead. To quote a single example: If the Holy Father were to acknowledge all the "accomodamenti" (changes or arrangements) made by Napoleon in Germany and in Italy, it would render the other sovereigns of Europe hostile to him and tend to isolate him. It would also imply that he approved of the spoliation of the ecclesiastical Princes, of the chapters and of the monasteries of Germany, as well as of the many attacks on the possessions and the liberties of the Church which had taken place in Italy. The Cardinal, therefore, advised the rejection of these proposals, and that the Pope should make known to all Christendom by a strong, yet dignified protest, the excessive burdens which Napoleon sought to impose on the Holy See, and then implore the assistance of the Almighty by public prayers, and leave to Him the guidance of future events.<sup>19</sup> The Pope, therefore, when replying to Cardinal de Bayane on December 3, 1807, and again in another letter addressed to him by Cardinal Casoni on December 28, pointed out to him that if he were to consent to have the same friends and the same enemies as France, it would place him in a state of perpetual warfare absolutely incompatible with his character as a minister of peace, and that if he took part in hostilities against England, he should be deprived of all communication with the Catholics of that kingdom. The increase in the number of the French Cardinals, so strongly insisted on by the Emperor, would be subversive of the fundamental laws of the Holy See and of the Sacred College; it would also be an attack on the independence of the Holy See, and it would give rise to similar demands on the part of other Catholic powers. These conditions, therefore, as well as the others, which he also discussed, rendered it impossible that he should agree to a treaty which was incompatible with his liberty and independence as a sovereign, and if it were not withdrawn, the Cardinal should ask for his passports and leave Paris.

While Cardinal de Bayane was negotiating with M. de Champagne in Paris Napoleon had made a journey of inspection through North Italy, and when at Milan had met Cardinal Oppizoni, Archbishop of Bologna, and Cardinal Caselli, Archbishop of Parma, who had been charged by the Pope to make him a ceremonious visit. In his interview with them the Emperor again boasted of the services he had rendered to religion and complained of the proceedings of the Court of Rome, threatening that if it did not change its ways he

---

<sup>19</sup> Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 377.



would undo all that Charlemagne had done in favor of the Church. He again insisted on the expulsion of the English from the Papal States; on the acceptance by the Pope of the political changes which had taken place in Italy, and he ended by saying that he would wait for two months longer, after which, if he were not satisfied, he would take action.

On his return to Paris he expressed to Cardinal de Bayane, by a letter from de Champagny, his Minister of Foreign Affairs, the regret and the surprise which he felt that the Holy See, with which he ardently desired to be reconciled, should seek to avoid all agreement between the two powers; that it should refuse to unite with him against England and to arrest the Neapolitan brigands who had taken refuge in Rome; that it should persist in not recognizing the King of Naples, and to show the greatest obstinacy in refusing to augment the number of French Cardinals in proportion to the extent of the Empire. This refusal was most keenly felt by His Majesty. As protector of the clergy of his Empire, he saw with pain that the Holy See, from which the prelates of France might have expected to meet with favor and good will, rendered no justice to their intelligence, and that Cardinal de Bayane had been ordered to break off the negotiation and return to Rome. The Sovereign of Rome, therefore, does not wish for a reconciliation, but prefers a state of hostility against France; he wishes to risk an appeal to arms and to expose himself to the losses which may be the consequence. The Emperor sees it with grief and regret; for three years he has suppressed his just resentment, but the Pope's last refusals and the orders given to Cardinal de Bayane have exhausted his patience. Let the negotiation, therefore, be broken off, since the Pope wishes it. Let Cardinal de Bayane receive his passports and return to Rome.<sup>20</sup>

On the same day Cardinal Caprara was informed by M. de Champagny that if the Pope still refused to yield to the demands already mentioned, the Emperor would publish a decree, by which the provinces occupied by the French troops should be united to the Kingdom of Italy and the province of Perugia to Tuscany. The Ambassador at Rome, M. Alquier, would give the Pope five days to come to a decision. If His Holiness did not accept the conditions, the French embassy would leave at once and the French generals

<sup>20</sup> This letter is a hitherto inedited document. Padre Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 395, very justly calls it a masterpiece of the art of lying. Napoleon must have known that Pius VII. could not accept the conditions he laid down without sacrificing his independence; that the Papal treasury was exhausted by the enormous contributions he demanded for his troops, and that by seizing on various portions of the Papal territories he had obliged the Pope to recall his Legate and his special envoy.

would execute the orders about to be sent to them. The Emperor would most assuredly not yield; he would have all or nothing. That evening the Cardinal had an audience at the Tuileries, where Napoleon, who manifested much irritation, told him that although his patience was exhausted, yet if the Pope agreed to his requests he would restore to him the provinces occupied by his troops. If not, Generals Lemarois and Miollis would seize what remained of the Papal States and place a garrison in Rome. It was in vain that the Cardinal reasoned and implored. His arguments were either flung aside as representing antiquated ideas or were listened to in silence and left unanswered. His appeals to the Emperor's generosity seemed to strengthen his resolution not to yield.

The Emperor's demands, which reached Rome on January 22, were again submitted to the Sacred College and again rejected; but Pius VII. in his anxiety to make every effort to obtain peace consented, in a note addressed to Alquier, to grant some of them with regard to which his conscience could allow him to yield, and he refused only to take part in a confederation and to name as many French Cardinals as Napoleon demanded. But it was too late; the order for the occupation of Rome had been already issued, and any concession on the part of the Holy Father was useless. On January 10, the day after his interview with Cardinal Caprara, Napoleon wrote to Prince Eugène to order General Miollis to march upon Rome with 2,500 men from Tuscany and an equal number from Ancona, while Joseph Napoleon was directed to send 3,000 French and Neapolitan troops to Terracina, so as to support him if necessary. The greatest secrecy was to be observed with regard to this expedition, which was to march as though destined to join the army in Naples. On reaching Rome Miollis was to take possession of the Castle of Saint Angelo and to render the greatest honor to the Pope—"*tous les honneurs possibles*." He was to announce that it was his duty to arrest the Neapolitan brigands who took refuge in Rome, and he was to seize King Ferdinand's Consul, the English Consul and the other English subjects in the city. He was not, however, to take part in the government, but he was to have the title of "commander-in-chief of the troops in the States of the Church" and to receive his orders only from the Emperor.<sup>21</sup>

On January 22 a despatch was sent to Alquier which should reach him two days before the arrival of General Miollis, in order to inform him that the general, though apparently marching upon Naples, was to stop in Rome and take possession of the Castle of

---

<sup>21</sup> Correspondance, t. XVI., No. 13,441. A Eugène Napoléon. Paris, 10 Janvier, 1808. No. 13,442. A Joseph Napoléon, Roi de Naples. Paris, 10 Janvier, 1808.

Saint Angelo. It contained also a note which Alquier was to present to the Cardinal Secretary of State as soon as he learned that the French troops were at the gates of Rome. This document stated that the general's mission was to seize the Neapolitan brigands who had taken refuge in Rome, and to insist that all the other Neapolitans should at once return to Naples. The Emperor hoped that His Holiness would order the Neapolitan Cardinals to leave also for Naples within forty-eight hours, to take the oath to their sovereign, as otherwise he would look upon them as being the protectors of the brigands. The agents of England who disturb Italy must also be arrested, and General Miollis is not to leave until Rome has been purged of all the enemies of France. Alquier was also informed that the Emperor had no desire to take anything away from the Pope, but he wished to exercise in the Papal States the same influence as in Naples, Spain, Bavaria and the States of the Federation. If, however, the Court of Rome were to commit any more imprudent acts, it would lose its temporal power forever. The conduct of the Pope would decide what steps should be taken. Alquier was also instructed to prevent the circulation of any printed matter of a nature hostile to France; he was to tell the Governor of Rome and the head of the police that they should answer with their lives for the slightest insult offered to a Frenchman. By some lines written in cipher he was told that the Emperor's intention was to accustom the Roman people and the French troops to live together, so that if the Court of Rome continued to act in the same insane fashion, it should cease to exist as a temporal power by slow degrees and without any one being aware of it. The Emperor concluded by asserting that although he wished to leave matters in *statu quo* and to avoid making a disturbance, yet if the Pope were to publish a bull he would immediately issue a decree to revoke the donation of Charlemagne and unite the States of the Church to the Kingdom of Italy.<sup>22</sup>

M. Alquier, the French Ambassador, had been a member of the convention and had voted for the death of Louis XVI., but, like his predecessor, M. Cacaault, his stay in Rome had rendered him somewhat less of a revolutionist and inspired him with friendly feelings towards the Pope, whose defense he often ventured to take against Napoleon. He was ashamed to present to the Holy Father a letter containing such brutal and insolent expressions, and was in consequence recalled shortly afterwards by the Emperor.<sup>23</sup> It is, how-

<sup>22</sup> Correspondance, t. XVI., No. 13,477. A. M. de Champagny, Ministre des relations extérieures. Paris, 22 Janvier, 1808.

<sup>23</sup> Lettres inédites de Napoléon I. publiées par Léon Lecestre. Paris, 1897, t. I., No. 227. Au Prince Eugène Napoléon, Vice-roi d'Italie. Paris, 17 Février, 1808. Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 412.



ever, a fact that on January 29 he assured Cardinal Casoni that the troops of General Miollis would pass through the Papal States without stopping, and gave him a copy of their line of march, which he had received from the general, though from the Emperor's letter he must have known that his statement was false and that the marches beyond Rome indicated in the general's itinerary were not to be made.<sup>24</sup>

Pius VII. had at first intended to order the gates of Rome to be closed, so that the French troops should be obliged to take possession of the city by force and thereby openly declare their hostile intentions; but, yielding to the prayers of the Cardinals, he at last consented to offer no resistance.

The entry of the army of General Miollis into Rome, the seizure of the Castle of St. Angelo and the threatening display of artillery in front of the palace of the Quirinal have been described in the preceding number of the REVIEW. As in the case of the other attacks on the possessions of the Church, the Holy Father could offer no other defense than the publication of a protest against the invasion of Rome. His sacred duties, he said, and the dictates of his conscience would not allow him to agree to the demands of the French Government, and he was therefore obliged to submit to the disastrous consequences with which he had been threatened and to the military occupation of his capital. Resigned, however, to the inscrutable judgments of the Almighty, in all humility he placed his cause in the hands of God, and wishing to fulfill the obligations imposed on him of defending his sovereign rights, he had commanded his Minister to protest in his name and in that of his successors against the occupation of his States. He then, as Vicar upon earth of the God of peace, who by His Divine example taught us meekness and patience, appealed to his subjects, who had given him so many proofs of obedience, to remain calm and not to be guilty of any offense against any member of a nation from which he had received so many proofs of devotion and affection during his journey to Paris and while he dwelt there.<sup>25</sup>

The Holy Father consented to grant an audience to General Miollis on the day of his arrival in Rome. On seeing him the Pope said to him: "General, your cannons have not frightened us," and

<sup>24</sup> Relation de ce qui s'est passé à Rome dans l'envahissement des états du Saint Siège par les Français. . . . Pièces officielles et authentiques. A Londres, 1812, t. I., p. 13. Alquier à Casoni, 29 Janvier, 1808. "J'ai l'honneur de transmettre à Votre Eminence la copie de l'itinéraire qui sera suivie par deux colonnes de troupes, formant 6,000 hommes; les quelles doivent, sans s'arrêter, traverser l'état Romain. Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 411. According to this document, they were to have been at Albano, a day's march beyond Rome, on the 4th February.

<sup>25</sup> Cantù, *op. cit.*, p. 341.

dismissed him after a short conversation. Cardinal Doria-Pamphili, who had succeeded Cardinal Casoni as Secretary of State, then addressed to Alquier in the name of the Pope an indignant denial of the calumnious accusations made by the Emperor against the Papal Government of connivance with the Neapolitan brigands and of intriguing against France with the agents of foreign powers. He added that as long as Rome should be occupied by foreign troops His Holiness would consider himself as a prisoner and would refuse to open any negotiation until they had been withdrawn from his capital.<sup>26</sup>

General Miollis soon began to act as though in a conquered city and to suppress by force every expression of disapprobation of the Emperor's proceedings. On February 17 Padre Lucchesi, of the order of St. Augustine and rector of the church of that name, whose sermons on the Macchabees had apparently displeased the French, was arrested and transferred from one fortress to another until he was finally banished to the island of Piombino. He was the first of a large number of priests who incurred Napoleon's anger and who underwent deportation or imprisonment while the imperial government held possession of Rome.<sup>27</sup>

In the beginning of March the general caused the post office to be seized for the purpose of preventing any communication with the rest of Europe, and by means of the treachery of a Swiss officer, Lieutenant Colonel Baron de Fries, who deceived the soldiers under his command as to the Holy Father's intentions, the Papal troops were incorporated in the French army. Colonels Bracci and Cotti and the other officers who remained faithful to the Pope were imprisoned in the Castle of St. Angelo and then exiled.<sup>28</sup>

In order to isolate the Pope still more by depriving him of the assistance of the Sacred College, the Neapolitan Cardinals were ordered by General Miollis, on February 27, to leave Rome within twenty-four hours for Naples, and as the Pope forbade them to obey they were arrested and led to the frontier by French soldiers.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Relation, etc., t. I., p. 61. Cardinal Giuseppe Doria-Pamphili à M. Alquier. Du Palais du Quirinal, 25 Février, 1808.

<sup>27</sup> In his letter to Prince Eugene of January 23, 1808, Napoleon had ordered that after February 2 all couriers carrying the mails should be searched. The letters for Vienna, France and Germany should be put aside; those for the Kingdom of Italy should be read and thrown into the fire if they contained any insult to France. If they contained any imprudent act on the part of the Pope, they shall be allowed to pass a few days later, after withdrawing all bulls, briefs, forms of prayer or other writings composed with the object of exciting the people.—Lettres inédites, t. I., No. 213. Au Prince Eugène Napoléon, Vice-roi d'Italie. Paris, 23 Janvier, 1808.

<sup>28</sup> Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 426.

<sup>29</sup> Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 429. They were Cardinals Saluzzo, Pignatelli, Ruffo-Scilla and Caracciolo, and p. 434.

At Gaeta they were asked to take the oath to Joseph Bonaparte, and as they refused, the King ordered them to be set free at Terracina, whence the Emperor ordered Cardinal Ruffo to be brought to Paris and the other Cardinals to be sent to Bologna.

The expulsion of the Neapolitan Cardinals was soon followed by that of sixteen others belonging to various parts of Italy, who were commanded to leave Rome within three days. They refused to comply, and with the exception of a few, who were too infirm to travel, they were seized and escorted to their respective destinations.

According to the instructions of the Emperor, General Miollis tried to establish friendly relations between the Romans and their French conquerors by keeping open house at the Palazzo Doria on a scale of considerable splendor.<sup>30</sup> A word of disapprobation from the Holy Father soon recalled to a sense of their duty the Romans who had accepted the general's hospitality, and with the exception of three or four nobles whose liberal opinions were already well known, they ceased to appear at his receptions.<sup>31</sup> The general then caused the anniversary of the Pope's election (March 14) to be celebrated by salvos of artillery from the Castle of St. Angelo, for which he was severely rebuked by the Emperor. He was told that since the Pope conducted himself so badly towards him, he should return ill usage for ill usage. He should keep his troops well in hand and put down the slightest disturbance with grape shot.<sup>32</sup>

General Miollis faithfully obeyed the Emperor's instructions and lost no opportunity of offering fresh insults to the Holy Father. On April 7 a detachment of French soldiers appeared at the gates of the Quirinal. The Swiss sentinel on guard refused to admit them, but told the officer in command that he might enter alone. The officer, therefore, halted his men a few steps away, but as soon as he crossed the threshold he called them up. They pushed forward, disarmed the Swiss and entered the palace. They then broke open the doors of two armories and took away the carbines carried by the noble guard and the other soldiers while on duty in the anti-chambers. At the same time other detachments of French troops arrested in their palaces about forty members of the noble guard and imprisoned them in the Castle of St. Angelo.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>30</sup> He was to be allowed 15,000 francs (\$3,000) a month, besides a gift of 90,000 francs (\$18,000) from the proceeds of the sale of the English merchandise seized in Tuscany.—*Lettres inédites*, t. I., Nos. 232 and 234. Au Prince Eugène. Paris, 18 and 28 Février, 1808.

<sup>31</sup> Louis Madelin, *La Rome de Napoléon. La domination Française à Rome—de 1809 à 1814*. Paris, 1906, pp. 182, 185.

<sup>32</sup> *Lettres inédites*, t. I., No. 255. Au Prince Eugène Napoléon, Vice-roi d'Italie. Saint Cloud, 27 Mars, 1808. "Qu'à la moindre émeute, il la réprime avec la mitraille."

<sup>33</sup> Cantù, *op. cit.*, p. 354. Protest addressed by Cardinal Gabrielli to the foreign Ministers in Rome, 7th April, 1808. P. 356, Letter from Sig. Alberti, representative of the Kingdom of Italy, to Sig. Testi, Minister of Foreign Affairs, 8th April, 1808.



A month previously to this outrage Pius VII. had already seen the advisability of ceasing all diplomatic relations with Napoleon and thereby forcing him to throw off the mask and to declare himself openly the enemy of the Holy See. He wrote, therefore, to Cardinal Caprara on March 4 that he should ask for his passports and leave Paris at once unless the French troops were withdrawn from Rome, the banished Cardinals allowed to return and the Roman soldiers restored to his service. His action would thus be a protest against the many unprovoked outrages perpetrated against his authority by the Emperor, and a proof that he had no intention of effecting a compromise with him by consenting to the annexation of his States.<sup>34</sup> The extremely timid character of Cardinal Caprara and his preference for adopting conciliatory measures by means of which he hoped to stave off an open rupture did not allow him to obey his instructions further than making the Pope's letter known to the imperial government, and Pius VII. was therefore obliged to repeat his orders. But Napoleon in his answer to Caprara on April 3 again insisted that the Holy Father should form an offensive and defensive league with the other Italian States. If he refused to do so, it would be a sign that he did not desire any understanding or peace with the Emperor, and that he declared war against him. "The first result of war is conquest, and the first result of a conquest is a change of government; . . . if the Emperor is obliged to go to war with Rome, is he not also obliged to conquer it, to change its government and to establish another which shall join with the Kingdoms of Italy and Naples against the common enemy?" Napoleon then went on to remark in that tone of affected piety which he so frequently employed in his communications with the Holy See that the withdrawal of the Cardinal's powers had taken place on the "eve of Holy Week, when the Court of Rome, if it were still animated by a truly evangelical spirit, might think that it ought rather encrease spiritual assistance and preach union among the faithful by its example." He then expressed his regret that the passports should have been demanded, as according to modern ideas such an act constituted a declaration of war. "Rome was therefore at war with France." M. Lefebvre, the French *Chargé d'Affaires* in Rome, received at the same time orders to ask for his passports and leave Rome by April 20 if the Pope still refused to join in an offensive and defensive league with the Kingdoms of Italy and Naples for the defense of the Italian peninsula.<sup>35</sup>

Pius VII. was informed on April 13 of the Emperor's denuncia-

---

<sup>34</sup> Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 443.

<sup>35</sup> Correspondance, t. XVI., Nos. 13,709 and 13,714. A. M. de Champigny, *Ministre des relations extérieures*. Saint Cloud, 11er Avril, 1808.

tions. His reply did not vary from his previous declarations. He showed that it would be incompatible with his duty and injurious to the interests of religion for him to join in a league and be hostile to the powers with which the Emperor might think fit to go to war. He would not, indeed, be able to prevent the Emperor from destroying the temporal power, but he would place his confidence in the protection of God, as he felt conscious that he had not brought this misfortune on himself by imprudence, by obstinacy or by blindness, but because he had performed his duty faithfully. He then pointed out that the outrages committed in Rome by the Emperor's soldiers in spite of his remonstrances and protests, rendered the recall of his Legate absolutely necessary in order to prove to the whole world that he had not secretly consented to the wrongs which had been inflicted on him. It was on Napoleon's will alone, the Holy Father continued, that this war depended; he alone could be accused of this attack on the temporal power of the Papacy. His seizure of the States of the Church could not be called a conquest, since the Pope is at peace with the whole world, but rather a most violent usurpation. Pius VII. concluded by declaring that he adored the decrees of heaven; that he found consolation in the thought that God was Lord of all, and that everything yields to His will, when comes the fullness of time preordained by Him.<sup>36</sup>

On the day before Cardinal Caprara received his passports Napoleon published a decree by which he announced that, "Seeing that the temporal Sovereign of Rome had constantly refused to declare war against the English and to unite with the Kings of Italy and of Naples for the defense of the Italian peninsula; that the interests of the two kingdoms demand that their communications should not be interrupted by a hostile power; that the donation by Charlemagne, our illustrious predecessor, of the territories which form the Papal States was made for the advantage of Christianity, and not for that of the enemies of our holy religion, and that the Ambassador from the Court of Rome to us has asked for his passports, we have decreed, and we decree, that the provinces of Urbino, Ancona, Macerata and Camerino shall be united to our Kingdom of Italy irrevocably and forever." Other paragraphs appointed the 11th of May as the day for taking formal possession of those provinces, ordered the *Code Napoléon* to be published there, and that they should be divided into three departments, organized and administered according to the laws and regulations existing in the Kingdom of Italy. By another decree of the same date Napoleon ordered

---

<sup>36</sup> Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 455. Cardinal Caprara was given his passports on April 3, 1808, and thus ceased to be Papal Legate. He still continued, however, to reside in France until his death, on June 21, 1810.—Rinieri, p. 478.

all the Cardinals, prelates, officers and functionaries of the Court of Rome who were born in the Kingdom of Italy to return there after May 25, under pain of the sequestration of their goods if they did not obey before June 5.<sup>37</sup>

The decree of annexation was sent to Prince Eugène with the order to keep it secret until April 30. If before that date the Pope should consent to join the league, the Prince should be informed of it by the French *Chargé d'Affaires* in Rome. There was plenty of time, therefore, to make every preparation so that the event should take place quite unexpectedly.<sup>38</sup>

Before this decree was known in Rome General Miollis had caused Mgr. Cavalchini, the Governor of Rome, to be arrested and had sent him under an escort of dragoons to the fortress of Fenes-trelles.<sup>39</sup> He was accused of "refusing to administer justice according to the laws and the regulations of the State," or, in other words, of having remained faithful to the authority of the Holy Father and refused to acknowledge that of the general.

Pius VII. protested against the annexation of his provinces in an eloquent letter addressed to Cavaliere Alberti, the representative in Rome of the Kingdom of Italy. He again asserted that his sacred character of Minister of peace and his rank of Head of the Church and universal Pastor could not allow him to enter into a system of permanent warfare, especially against a nation which had not offended him. The Holy Father then showed how false were the various pretexts by which the Emperor tried to justify his usurpation. That founded on the donation of Charlemagne was simply astounding, for it was well known that the annexed provinces already belonged to the Popes, having been freely given to them by the people when they had been abandoned by the Emperors of the East. They were afterwards seized by the Lombards, reconquered by King Pepin, the father of Charlemagne, and restored to the Church. His gift was confirmed by Charlemagne, who in his will ordered his three sons to defend the possessions of the Holy See, and who gave his successors no power to revoke what he had done.

The statement that the "donation of Charlemagne was not made for the advantage of the enemies of our holy religion" was especially painful to the Pope, as it seemed to accuse him of having betrayed the interests of religion, when, on the contrary, he has been persecuted since three years for the cause of religion and for having been faithful to his Apostolic duties. He refused to accept the principles

<sup>37</sup> Cantù, *op. cit.*, p. 352. Decrees published at Saint Cloud, April 2, 1808.

<sup>38</sup> Correspondance, t. XVI., No. 13,716. A Eugène Napoléon, Vice-roi

<sup>39</sup> A strong fortress in the Alps, forty-five miles to the west of Turin, d'Italie. Saint Cloud, 3 Avril, 1808. "De manière que tout cela se fasse comme un coup de théâtre."



laid down by Napoleon—that, if the Holy Father is Sovereign of Rome, His Majesty is its Emperor; that the Pope should be his subject in temporal matters, as he was the Pope's subject in spiritual matters, and that the Pope should look upon the enemies of France as his own. The oath taken by the Holy Father to preserve the independence necessary for the free exercise of his spiritual sovereignty rendered it impossible for him to accept these subversive maxims.

The second decree by which the Cardinals and other dignitaries of the Court of Rome were ordered to leave was evidently an attack on the spiritual authority of the Holy Father, as it aimed at disorganizing the government of the Church by depriving him of those who helped him in the performance of his duties. Pius VII. ended by protesting against the usurpation of his territories; he declared it to be unjust, null and invalid, and that his legitimate rights and those of his successors could never be abolished. Although deprived of them by force, he preserved them intact in his heart, so that he might take possession of them again whenever it should be pleasing to God.<sup>40</sup>

Towards the end of May the Holy Father addressed an encyclical to the Bishops of the annexed provinces in order to lay down the rules which should guide them in their dealings with the new government. He began by stating that if the antiquity of the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See did not suffice to guarantee it from all invasion, no possessions, no property, no rights could remain safe and steadfast among men. He showed that the sovereignty of the Pope was not only legitimate in its origin and had been peaceably possessed during centuries, but that it had also characteristics peculiar to itself. Thus the possession of the dominion (*la proprietà del dominio*) does not dwell in the person of the reigning Pope, who has only the temporary use of it and who is sworn to preserve it for the Church and to transmit it to his successors. Moreover, this sovereignty is closely connected with the interests and the prosperity of the Catholic religion, to which it is of the utmost importance that its Head, the Father of all the faithful, should be independent and should exercise freely, safely and impartially the spiritual power which God has given him over the whole world. The Popes have, therefore, always felt it to be their duty to preserve it with all its rights, even at the price of any sacrifice, and Catholic Emperors and Kings have felt the obligation of protecting and defending, even by arms, the patrimony of the Prince of the Apostles. The Roman Pontiffs could not inflict any injury on this tem-

---

<sup>40</sup> Relation, etc., t. I., p. 146. Cardinale Gabrielli al Sig. Cavaliere Alberti, incaricato d'affari del Regno Italico, 19 Maggio, 1808.

poral sovereignty or renounce it without becoming themselves accomplices and coöperators in the outrages and the losses which would be the result for the Church.

The Holy Father then showed that the government which was being substituted for that of the Church had been known everywhere to encroach upon the spiritual authority and to protect all sects. The forms of its oaths, its constitutions, its code of laws showed an indifference to all religion, which, as it supposes the existence of no religion, is a system most opposed to the Catholic religion, which, being divine, is necessarily without an equal and can form no alliance with any other, any more than Christ with Belial. The boasted protection of all religions by the French Government is only a pretext for the secular power to interfere in religious matters, since the consideration shown for the opinions and usages of every sect is not extended to the rights, the institutions or the laws of the Catholic religion. Under this protection lies concealed a most insidious and dangerous persecution against the Church of Christ, well adapted to throw it into disorder or even to destroy it if it were possible that the force and fraud of hell could ever prevail against it.

After this preamble, of which the above is only a short summary, the Pope laid down rules for the guidance of his subjects in their dealings with the usurping government, which it was not lawful for them to countenance or assist. Firstly, it was forbidden to take an oath of fidelity to the intrusive government, which should be expressed in unlimited terms exacting a positive fidelity and approbation, as that would be an act of felony towards the lawful sovereign and would tend to establish and confirm the usurpation.

Secondly, it was not allowed to accept, and still less to solicit, any post or employment which might tend more or less directly to acknowledge or assist the new government, especially if such posts had any direct influence on the execution of laws contrary to the laws of the Church.

Thirdly, the Bishops and all other ecclesiastics were forbidden to sing the "Te Deum" if ordered to so for the establishment of the invading government. Not only the secular authorities had no power to order public prayers, but in this case it would be an insult, and a joyful hymn would be contrary to the feelings which ought to prevail among the faithful sons of the Church at a time when its temporal power had been overthrown and a government hostile to it installed.

Nevertheless, in consideration of the welfare of his subjects and while maintaining the rights of the Church, the Holy Father allowed them, in case they could not avoid taking the oath without incurring serious danger, to swear that they would not take part in any con-

spiracy or sedition, but would submit to the government and obey it in everything that should not be contrary to the laws of God and of the Church.<sup>41</sup>

Shortly afterwards the Bishops of the provinces just annexed to the Kingdom of Italy were requested by General Lemarois to go to Milan to swear fidelity to the Emperor; by other official circulars it was ordered to recite at Mass the prayer "Domine Salvum fac Imperatorum," and the parish priests were forbidden to celebrate a marriage unless the civil marriage had first taken place. Letters from Cardinal Gabrielli, on the other hand, reminded the prelates of the prohibition of the oath recently issued by the Holy Father and forbade them to allow the parish priests to obey the order of the government. The result was that on June 16 two French officers entered Cardinal Gabrielli's apartments in the Quirinal, seized and sealed up his papers and ordered him to leave Rome in two days for Senigaglia. Cardinal Bartolomeo Pacca was requested by the Holy Father to take his place. It was with much reluctance that he consented to occupy a position of so much responsibility and danger, but the dread of being accused of cowardice and the memory of the oath taken when he was admitted into the Sacred College made him decide to accept, and from that moment, as he declares in his Memoirs, he felt within himself a courage which never abandoned him in all the fatigues, the troubles and the hardships which he underwent in the course of his ministry.<sup>42</sup>

General Miollis still continued to encroach on the independence of the Holy Father and to persecute those who persisted in remaining faithful to him. In Rome several functionaries of the Papal Government were arrested and imprisoned in the Castle of St. Angelo, and as the officers commanding the Papal troops in the provinces refused to make their soldiers lay down their arms or to obey other orders than those of the Pope, they were arrested and imprisoned and the armories of the provincial militia seized and plundered.<sup>43</sup> Another attack on the Quirinal soon followed. General Miollis was anxious to obtain from the Secretary of State various documents required for the administration of justice in the recently annexed provinces, but as this concession would have been equivalent to an acknowledgment of the new government, Cardinal Pacca refused, though he was willing to allow the documents to be copied. The palace was therefore invaded on August 13. Sentinels were placed at all the doors and a search made for the papers.

<sup>41</sup> Relation, etc., t. I., p. 183. Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 460, 22 Maggio, 1808.

<sup>42</sup> Card. Bartolomeo Pacca, *Memorie Storiche*. Orvieto, 1843, t. I., p. 126.

<sup>43</sup> Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 472. Relation, etc., t. I., pp. 218, 222. Card. Pacca au Général Miollis, 25 Juin, 30 Juin, 1808.



Other patrols arrested Cardinal Vincenti, the Pro-Camerlengo, as well as the Treasurer, who were kept prisoners until the papers which were in the archives of the different courts of law and congregations were given up.<sup>44</sup>

While Cardinal Gabrielli was still Secretary of State the French military authorities had begun to raise in each town bodies of citizen soldiers known as the civic guard. Some of the members of these corps were honorable citizens, anxious to maintain order and repress crime, but the majority, and especially the chiefs, were revolutionists, by means of whom the French were secretly preparing the formation of a government destined to replace the Papal administration. Cardinal Gabrielli, and after him Cardinal Pacca, frequently complained to General Miollis of the outrages committed by many of the leaders of these bands on their fellow-citizens, but without obtaining any result. Pius VII., therefore, seeing the uselessness of his remonstrances, published at last, on August 28, a proclamation, in which he forbade his subjects, under pain of excommunication, to form part of these troops, which would probably be commanded to make war on his government, and, to the surprise of the French, the more respectable members of the civic guard immediately obeyed and laid down their arms.<sup>45</sup>

As General Miollis ascribed this energetic and successful action on the part of the Pope to the influence of Cardinal Pacca, he resolved to expel him from Rome. On September 6 Major Muzio, a Piedmontese officer on the general's staff, accompanied by another officer and a sergeant, entered his rooms in the Quirinal and informed him that he should leave Rome on the following day, with an escort of dragoons, for his home in Benevento. The Cardinal replied that while in Rome he could receive orders only from the Pope, and as the officers refused to allow him to leave the room, he sent the Holy Father a note to inform him of what had occurred. In a few minutes Pius VII. appeared. So great was his indignation at the insult to his Minister that, as Cardinal Pacca relates, his hair was standing on end. He told the officer to inform General Miollis that he was weary of undergoing such outrages and insults from one who still called himself a Catholic; that he saw that the object of this violence was to deprive him of all his ministers, one by one, so as to render it impossible for him to exercise his apostolic ministry and the rights of his temporal power. He therefore ordered Cardinal Pacca not to obey this illegal command, but to follow him to his apartments, and there share his captivity, and declared that if

<sup>44</sup> Pacca, *Memorie*, t. I., p. 137.

any attempt should be made to take him away the general would

<sup>45</sup> Léon Madelin, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

have to break open all the doors by force and should be held responsible for the consequences.<sup>46</sup>

On the same day the aged Cardinal Antonelli, the Dean of the Sacred College, and Mgr. Arezzo, the Pro-Governor of Rome, were arrested and sent away the same evening under an escort. From that time greater precautions against a sudden attack were adopted at the Quirinal. The doors were strengthened with beams, the lower windows were walled up and the few Swiss still in the service of the Holy See watched unceasingly. On the other hand, French sentinels were stationed at the entrance of the streets leading to the palace; the carriages leaving it were stopped and examined, and persons carrying away parcels arrested and searched.<sup>47</sup>

The uncertainty which prevailed with regard to the future of Rome, the widely spread misery which resulted from the closure of manufactories and the exile of so many Cardinals and functionaries and vague rumors of an approaching insurrection contributed to entertain both among the Romans and the French a feeling of uneasiness and almost of terror. Thus it was assured that on the day of Cardinal Pacca's arrest twenty thousand persons were ready to rise, and that the Holy Father was obliged to send that night priests whom he could trust to restrain and pacify the people.<sup>48</sup> English cruisers also made frequent descents on the coasts, attacking the watchtowers and thus causing those who were loyal to the Holy Father to hope for a speedy intervention of an English army. An attempt was even made, about this time, by the English Government to rescue Pius VII., of which he was informed, but he declined to accept the offer, as he feared that his flight might be made the pretext for a still more cruel persecution of the clergy, and he preferred to remain at his post, even at the risk of being exposed to the greatest dangers.<sup>49</sup>

From a contemporary and hitherto inedited account by Padre Angiolini, a Jesuit Father, the idea would seem to be due to Robert Fagan, a British subject long resident in Rome, whence he was expelled by order of the Emperor in September, 1807, a Catholic, and probably an Irishman. His plan was heartily adopted by Ferdinand IV., King of Naples, then in exile in Palermo, who in May, 1808, placed a frigate at his service. From Fiumicino, at the mouth of the Tiber, he was able by means of a trusty messenger to enter into communication with Cardinal Gabrielli and the Pope,

<sup>46</sup> Pacca, *Memorie*, t. I., pp. 146, 225.

<sup>47</sup> Pacca, *Memorie*, t. I., pp. 150, 229. Madelin, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

<sup>48</sup> Mayol de Lupé. Un Pape prisonnier. *Le Correspondant*, 25 Décembre, 1884, pp. 991-995. Letters from Alberti, 11 April, 1808, and from Ortolì, a French agent in Rome.

<sup>49</sup> Pacca, *Memorie*, t. I., p. 160.

who declined to leave Rome unless he were invited to Sicily by the King and assured of the protection of the English Court. Fagan was soon provided with letters from the King and from General Stewart, the commander of the English troops in Sicily, but as the Holy Father did not consider that the latter had been authorized by government to act in his favor, he declined to accept, and the enterprise seemed to have failed. About the same time, however, Mgr. Lorenzo Caleppi, the Papal Nuncio in Portugal, who, when the royal family had fled to Brazil on the approach to Lisbon of the French troops under Marshal Junot, had taken refuge in England, succeeded in persuading the English Government to interest itself in the fate of the Holy Father and to take steps to provide for his safety. In consequence, therefore, of orders given to Admiral Collingwood, then in command of the English fleet in the Mediterranean, the frigate *Alcestis*, of forty-six guns, under Captain Maxwell, was sent to Palermo, where it took on board Padre Angiolini, the superior of the Jesuits; two other fathers, Kenny and Gonzalez, and Padre Procida, a Franciscan, along with other persons who had taken part in the first expedition. They arrived at Ostia on August 30. Padre Procida succeeded in reaching Rome and having an interview with Cardinal Pacca, who promised to send an answer in three days. After waiting in vain for a week, the fathers returned to Palermo on an English sloop, but Captain Maxwell informed them that he had orders not to leave the coast until the affair was ended. A third attempt was then made by a Colonel Vanni, a Papal subject serving in the Neapolitan army. He landed at Fiumicino towards the end of September, and probably succeeded in reaching the Quirinal, but was seized by the French while on his way back, tried by court-martial and shot in Rome on the Piazza del Popolo. Nevertheless, Captain Maxwell, on board whose frigate rooms had been richly fitted up for the reception of the Holy Father, continued to cruise during all the winter off Fiumicino, cannonading the watch-towers along the coast, until April, 1809, when, as there seemed to be no possibility of communicating with Rome, he returned to Palermo.<sup>50</sup>

A striking proof of the loyalty with which the great majority of the Roman people still remained attached to Pius VII. was given at the time of the carnival of 1809. That of 1808 had been forbidden

---

<sup>50</sup> Rinieri, *op. cit.*, pp. 482-493. Cardinal Gabrielli, who was Secretary of State at the time of Fagan's first message, was in favor of the Pope's flight from Rome, and had even made preparations for it. This may account for the fact that an apparently favorable answer was returned to his overtures. The Pope, however, does not seem to have ever intended to leave, according to Cardinal Pacca, who succeeded Gabrielli.—Pacca, *Memorie*, t. I., pp. 157, 160.



by the Papal Government in order to avoid all danger of a conflict between the French troops and the Roman people, but in 1809 General Miollis announced that the usual feasts, races and masquerades would take place. The Pope immediately published a notice to the effect that his government had not given its authorization, and that in the painful conditions in which the Church was then situated, he invited his people to recall to their memory the behavior of the faithful of the primitive Church, "Peter, therefore, was kept in prison. But prayer was made without ceasing by the Church to God for him," and he had no doubt that his loving subjects would imitate their glorious example. This simple expression of the will of the Holy Father was enough. With few exceptions the Roman people refused to take any share in the amusements of the carnival, and it was only by the employment of force that General Miollis could oblige the workmen to make the usual preparations for the horse races run in the Corso. The street was abandoned by all save the French and the spies in their service, and all the shops and the windows were closed. On the other hand, on the 21st of March, the anniversary of the coronation of Pius VII., the entire city was brilliantly illuminated and even the poorest districts took part in this spontaneous demonstration of loyalty to the Sovereign Pontiff.<sup>51</sup>

Napoleon now considered that the time had come to seize what still remained of the Papal States and put an end to the temporal power; but, wishing to justify his spoliation of the Holy See, at least in the eyes of his partisans, he ordered M. d'Hauterive, one of the principal authors of the *Articles Organiques*, to draw up a series of accusations against the Papal Government which might furnish him with plausible motives for his action. This mass of calumnies and falsehoods was presented to the Emperor on January 21, 1809. It stated that the temporal power could not be made to harmonize with the safety of His Majesty's armies in Italy; all methods of conciliation had been exhausted, and the evil should be cut off at its source. The temporal power, he asserted, was a gift of Charlemagne and his predecessors, who had reserved to themselves the sovereignty of the territories they had given to the Pope. Pius VII. was then severely blamed for his obstinacy in refusing to join the Emperor in an offensive and defensive alliance, and as Rome had become a centre of English intrigues against France, the Emperor was advised to take back the gifts of Charlemagne, which were being used against the successors of Charlemagne. The Pope should, however, remain the most wealthy and the most respected of all the pastors of nations, and be surrounded with an incompar-

<sup>51</sup> Pacca, *Memorie*, t. I., p. 230. Rinieri, p. 502.

able dignity, but the time had now arrived to declare that the Papal States formed part of the French Empire.<sup>52</sup>

The campaign against Austria delayed the Emperor for some time, but when, after the victories of Echmühl, Ratisbon and Ebersberg, he had occupied Vienna, he published, on May 17, two decrees at his headquarters at Schoenbrunn.

By the first of these decrees, after alluding to the misrepresentations contained in d'Hauteville's report, he declared that the States of the Church were united to the French Empire; that the city of Rome, the first see of Christendom, was to be a free and imperial city; that its monuments should be preserved at his expense; that the Pope was to enjoy an income of 2,000,000 francs, and that his palaces should be exempted from all taxes, jurisdiction and inspection. A second decree named a "*Consulta*," or commission of six persons to take possession of the Papal States in his name and prepare them for the establishment of a constitutional government.<sup>53</sup>

These decrees were not published immediately, as General Miollis was absent from Rome, but early on the morning of Saturday, June 10, the bridges across the Tiber were occupied by French troops, and at 9 o'clock the cannon of the Castle of St. Angelo began to fire a salute of one hundred guns, during which the Papal flag was lowered and the tricolor hoisted in its place. The imperial decree was read from the Senators' palace on the Capitol by a herald, who then, accompanied by an escort of cavalry, repeated it on the Piazza di Venezia, the Piazza Colonna and the Piazza del Popolo. On the same evening the *Consulta* introduced itself to the Romans by a lengthy proclamation informing them that "the will of the greatest of heroes had united them to the greatest of States," and depicted in glowing colors the era of prosperity which was about to dawn for the Eternal City.

On learning that the long expected blow had at last fallen, and that the temporal power was ended, Cardinal Pacca hastened to inform the Holy Father. While the guns were still thundering forth a salute to the French flag he read to him the imperial decree, copies of which were being spread over Rome, and asked him if he would not publish the bull of excommunication, which had been already prepared.<sup>54</sup> Pius VII. hesitated. He said that some of the expressions applied to the French Government seemed to him too strong; but the Cardinal replied that since such an important

<sup>52</sup> Mayol de Lupé. *Le Correspondant*, p. 999.

<sup>53</sup> *Correspondance*, t. XIX., Nos. 15,219 and 15,220. *Décret. Camp imperial à Vienne*, 17 Mai, 1809.

<sup>54</sup> Pacca, *Memorie*, t. I., p. 206. Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 515. The bull had been composed by Cardinal di Pietro, drawn up by Padre Fontana and approved by the Pope.

step had to be taken, it was necessary to paint such a picture of the injustice and the oppression caused by that government, that those who read it might say that the Pope had delayed too long to raise his voice against so many outrages and crimes. The Pope then raised his eyes towards heaven, and after a short pause said: "Very well; publish it. But," he added, "let those who carry out your orders take care not to be found out, for they would certainly be shot, and I would be inconsolable." A few courageous men, Lorenzo Mencacci and his sons, risked the danger,<sup>55</sup> and within a few hours the Papal bull, *Quum memoranda illa die*, was posted on the doors of the Lateran, of St. Peter's, of Sta. Maria Maggiore and in the other places where it was usual to publish official documents. A short summary of the bull, with the text of the excommunication, was posted up in many parts of Rome on the following day, as well as a protest, in which the Holy Father indignantly rejected the pension of 2,000,000 francs offered to him in exchange for his rights, the acceptance of which would cover him with shame in face of the Church, and he declared that he abandoned himself entirely to Providence and to the charity of the faithful.

In this bull Pius VII. recapitulated the long series of affronts, deceptions and outrages which the Holy See had experienced on the part of the French Government and the object of which was to overthrow the Catholic Church. He mentioned the fraudulent addition of the *Articles Organiques* to the French and Italian Concordats, in spite of his protestations; the unjust demands presented to him, and on his refusal to yield the invasion of Rome. Then came a slow and cruel persecution for the purpose of breaking down his resistance. His soldiers were forced to enter the French army; his guards imprisoned in the Castle of St. Angelo; the State printing office and that of the Propaganda subjected to military authority; newspapers full of calumnies against his government were published in Rome, while his protests were torn down from the walls and trampled under foot. Three of his Secretaries of State and most of the Cardinals had been seized and deported. Religious houses had been suppressed and their inmates expelled. The French code had been published containing laws opposed not only to those of the Church, but also to the precepts of the Gospel. The authority of the Bishops had been subjected to the secular power, and many of them had been forcibly driven from their sees.

What the Holy Father, however, most lamented was not his own sufferings, but the future fate of his persecutors, whose souls he would willingly save even by the sacrifice of his own life. But it was his duty to correct and chastise, and the time for mildness was

<sup>55</sup> Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 519.



past. Unless he wished to be accused of cowardice, of sloth and of having shamefully abandoned the cause of God, he should obey the evangelical precept: "And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." The Pope then pronounced sentence of excommunication against all those who in Rome or in the States of the Church had been guilty of the outrages against ecclesiastical immunities and the temporal rights of the Church, of which he had complained in his consistorial allocutions and in the many protests published by his order, as well as their adherents and councillors and those who had assisted in the perpetration of these crimes.

Still the Holy Father, remembering that he "held the place of Him who even when manifesting His justice did not forget to be merciful," forbade his subjects and all Christian people to make this bull a pretext for injuring any one of those whom it mentioned. For in chastising them by that kind of chastisement which God had put in his power, his chief object was their conversion, and while placing his cause in the hands of God, he implored of Him not to reject the prayers which he offered up by day and by night for their repentance and salvation.<sup>56</sup>

Napoleon's fury in learning that he had been excommunicated was expressed in a letter to Murat: "I have just been informed that the Pope has excommunicated us all. It is an excommunication against himself. No more consideration should be had for him. He is a madman who must be shut up. Make Cardinal Pacca and the other adherents of the Pope be arrested."<sup>57</sup>

Napoleon then ordered his Minister of Worship, Count Bigot de Préameneu, to translate the bull and advise him as to the course to pursue. The count, who, though friendly to the Church, was a strong Gallican, was of opinion that as the Pope forbade to injure the persons censured in the bull, an act of indulgence which he considered to be a mere subtlety on the part of the Court of Rome, and as he described in an exaggerated style what he had undergone, the bull might be considered as one of those useless protests which the Emperor had always put aside, and might share the same fate. Besides, there was no one named in the bull, and it was the custom of the Church not to include sovereigns in the censures pronounced against secular powers unless specially named. Still it would be better not to bring it before the Council of State, as that might draw public attention to it. The Emperor gave, therefore, strict orders to prevent the bull from becoming known.<sup>58</sup>

<sup>56</sup> Pacca, *Memorie*, t. I., pp. 234-273.

<sup>57</sup> *Lettres inédites*, t. I., No. 459. A Joachim Napoléon, roi de Naples, Schönbrunn, 20 Juin, 1809.

<sup>58</sup> Henri Welschinger, *Le Pape et l'Empereur, 1804-1815*. Paris, 1905, p. 94.

In Rome the partisans of the Emperor dreaded a popular rising and thought that the Holy Father would come forth from the Quirinal in his Pontifical robes to proclaim a religious war and to seek martyrdom at the tomb of Saint Peter.<sup>59</sup> The people, indeed, remained quiet, but all those who served the government in any way, not only the employés in the government offices, but even the porters of the custom house and the street sweepers, refused to work lest they should thereby incur the censures pronounced by the bull. A special congregation was, therefore, held by order of the Pope, which decided that as the persons excommunicated by name, they were not *vitandi*, and might be frequented in matters of business.<sup>60</sup>

The representatives, however, of the Emperor in Rome felt that the presence of the Sovereign Pontiff was a permanent protest against the usurper's government. Although he was a prisoner in his palace, his will was still obeyed. Most of the nobility still remained faithful to him, and Alberti, the envoy of Prince Eugène, accused him of "paralyzing everything with his obstinate resistance." There was also danger of a rising, for there were but few troops in Rome, and the appearance of an English fleet off the coast caused much agitation in the city, which necessitated the utmost vigilance on the part of the French. It was therefore decided that the Holy Father should be removed from Rome; but those who were chiefly implicated in the transaction would seem to have been anxious to avoid incurring the odium which would be naturally attached to it. General Miollis, writing to the Emperor, states that he had been ordered by him to maintain tranquillity in Rome, and had, therefore, ordered the arrest of Cardinal Pacca. As the Pope had resisted it, he was carried away, too. General Radet, who soon after June 10 had been sent to Rome along with 400 gendarmes by the Emperor, declares in his account of the event that he got written orders from Miollis to carry away Cardinal Pacca, and if the Pope resisted, to arrest him also. Others, on the contrary, assure that Radet obliged Miollis to give his consent. More recent researches tend to accuse Joachim Murat, the new King of Naples, of having played the most active part in the conspiracy. He had sent 800 Neapolitan soldiers to Rome to reinforce the garrison, and his Minister of Police, a Corsican named Saliceti, to hasten the accomplishment of the crime.<sup>61</sup> The identity, however, of the prime mover in the execution of this outrage against the Sovereign Pontiff matters little in presence of the fact that Joachim Murat was the grandmaster of the Italian Freemasons; that Miollis, Radet and Saliceti held high rank

<sup>59</sup> Cantù, p. 376. Alberti to Testi, 14 Giugno, 1809.

<sup>60</sup> Pacca, *Memorie*, t. I., p. 211. Rinieri, 532. Madelin, p. 223.

<sup>61</sup> Madelin, pp. 233, 681.

in that society, and that it may thus be safely asserted that "the storming of the Quirinal and the captivity of the Pope were nothing else than an exploit of Freemasonry."<sup>62</sup>

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

## THE SOURCES AND DESTINY OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

NO RELIGIOUS movement, save and except the great revolt of the sixteenth century, historically known as the Reformation, has had, and must continue to have, so vital and momentous an influence on the life and welfare of the Church as that which Froude has aptly designated "the Oxford Counter-Reformation," for, both in its professed object and in its inevitable results, it is no less. It is a movement, moreover, so contrary to all apparent probabilities, and which has, of late years especially, begun to assume a form which many of its earlier leaders deemed impossible, which only its enemies prophesied and professed to foresee as inevitable, that some account of its beginnings, of the sources and traditions whence it arose, however inadequate, will, I am convinced, prove of sufficient interest to justify my attempting so difficult a task.

It may be well, perhaps, to explain briefly at the outset that the main contention of those who inaugurated this counter-reformation, as of those who have carried it on, was and is that "the Church of England" which came into existence with Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity in 1559 is one and the same spiritual entity with the pre-reformation *Ecclesia Anglicana*, the Church of the English people founded by Saint Augustine. This contention rests chiefly on the fact that the new communion has retained from its inception, *ex professo*, the old orders of Bishops, priests and deacons, the old ecclesiastical divisions of parishes and dioceses, and that it was for nearly three centuries the only "Church" nominally "Catholic"—since it used the ancient creeds—of which the majority of Englishmen had any practical cognizance, or were willing to recognize, within the realm of England. The claim to "continuity" with the pre-reformation Church was and is, moreover, based on the fact that Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity did not, so far as words go, found a new communion, but set out to be merely a regulation of the existing religious controversies, to establish one form of worship, and one only, for all the Queen's subjects on the mediæval principle

<sup>62</sup> Rinieri, p. 539.



then widely accepted of *cuius regio, eius religio*—of a national unity which should be not only political, but religious as well. The phrase “by law established,” therefore, will, on this showing, be found to be a parliamentary one simply—one of the many infringements by the State on the supposed “liberties and prerogatives” of its own creation, “the Church of England,” though it may, of course, be interpreted as referring to the act of uniformity, and “established” be understood in the sense of “ordered” or “constituted.”

According to this view of the events of the sixteenth century, there was for the vast majority of Englishmen no conscious, definite transition from one religion to another, from the one Catholic Church to a national and heretical communion. More, it was and is maintained by those who contend for the “continuity” referred to that there was, in fact, no such change or transition; that the ancient Church of the English people merely underwent certain more or less regrettable modifications of doctrine, ritual and discipline, and though cut off, partly by her own fault, partly by that of “Rome,” from her ancient allegiance to the See of Peter, continued her former existence unbroken and practically unaltered. It is a view which, if studied in the aspect in which it presents itself to “Anglo-Catholics,” will be found to possess—always apart from the divine and inalienable claims of the Vicar of Christ—much to make it plausible to the heirs of Cranmer, Parker, Jewell and Laud.

Pusey, Newman and Keble, therefore, to mention these names only, proceeding on this contention of the spiritual identity of the National Establishment with the Church founded by Saint Augustine, aimed at no less than a complete “restoration” of their communion to the doctrines, practices and liberties of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* prior to “the unspeakable misfortune of the so-called reformation.” It is of the sources and of the latest phase of this movement that I wish to treat and to show, to the best of my ability, that the very formularies which owe their existence to the religious changes of the sixteenth century may fairly be taken as supporting this “Catholic” contention rather than the opposite and Protestant one; how the very “Book of Common Prayer” has made the Oxford Movement not only possible, but logical and inevitable, even to its latest development.

It is, I need hardly say, in no mere spirit of national pride, but as a simple statement of a fact capable, as I hold, of ample proof, that I have claimed for this strange and wonderful “counter-reformation” so large and important a place in the Church’s destinies. The loss of the English-speaking races was beyond question the most serious and irreparable of those inflicted in the sixteenth century. Its effects have in a very real sense been greater and more extensive,

though far other, than that of the Eastern schism, in proportion as heresy is a deadlier enemy to faith than the latter. The Latin races, in a word, may be said to stand in greater need, so far as the well-being of the Church in these later ages is concerned, of the sober, practical, somewhat unemotional Anglo-Scottish element than of the subtler, more metaphysical Oriental one. What the return of the former to Catholic unity would mean to the Church can only be estimated by those familiar with the type of religious character commonly known as "Anglican," which has been developed by three centuries of a schismatical and distinctively national "church" life, devotion and ritual, more than ever, of course, though more clearly differentiated in the last seventy-five years.

It is, therefore, in its relation to the possibility of such a return that the Oxford Movement is chiefly of interest to Catholics. I must, consequently, in such account as I shall here endeavor to give of it, present what may be called the case for the defense, the "Anglo-Catholic" position, as strongly and as favorably as it may be in my power to do so. I must, that is, make plain their claim to represent not only the true views of the original leaders of the movement, but also of a school within their own communion which from the reign of Edward VI. to the present day has asserted the corporate and continuous existence of the "Church of England" as identical with the pre-reformation *Ecclesia Anglicana*, and has interpreted the formularies of the Book of Common Prayer in a Catholic rather than in a Protestant sense.

The Oxford Movement, then, according to this view of it, traces its real origin back to the year 1547, and not merely to 1833, and was a reversion to principles, doctrines and practices which had never been wholly lost sight of rather than, as its enemies declared and have never ceased to declare, a wholly unauthorized and indefensible innovation. These principles, doctrines and practices, it is maintained by the "Catholic" party, are sanctioned, if not, indeed, actually enjoined by the supreme and final spiritual authority to which all Anglican churchmen are bound to defer, the Book of Common Prayer, and have been the true heritage of the "Church of England" ever since its separation from the centre of unity, just as truly and as certainly as they were prior to that greatest of all her misfortunes. How far they may be said to have made good their claim I hope in due course to show.

Before doing so, however, it may be well to recall briefly the main events which issued in the creation of an Anglican "Church" not in communion with the See of Peter. Henry's final breach with Rome, in 1535, was, it must be remembered, on constitutional rather than on doctrinal grounds—a schism such as that of Constantinople rather

than an open and formal lapse into heresy. To the day of his death Henry professed himself a Catholic, and so little intention had he of changing the doctrines and practices of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* that, as is well known, he sent the Catholic impugnors of his own supremacy in spirituals and the Protestant impugnors of the ancient faith side by side on the same hurdles, to the same scaffold, and not only desired in his will that his son should be brought up "in the Catholic faith," but also left large bequests for the saying of Masses "forever" for the repose of his soul.

"So long as Henry lived," we are told by Abbot Gasquet and Mr. Edmund Bishop, in "Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer" (page 40), "the English Church, although deprived of some dignity and strength, in her outward appearance remained unchanged. Her system of worship was the same as it had been for many generations." Moreover, the same authors add (page 42): "Under Henry, however strong his mind and masterful his will, even as supreme head, the old forms of ecclesiastical government retained an ecclesiastical aspect." The point is worth noting, as it accounts in a measure for the acquiescence of leading churchmen under Henry in His Grace's attitude towards the Holy See. Schism, they may be supposed to have reasoned, is at least less intolerable and more easily remedied than hesy—a judicious pliancy most assuredly preferable to martyrdom on behalf of a "disputed" claim to the governance of the National Church.

Into the means and causes, spiritual as well as political, by which England was severed from the divinely appointed centre of Catholic unity, there is no need to enter here. But there is need to insist, in justice to all concerned, in justice most of all to those who are responsible for the Oxford Movement, that the separation, whether under Henry, under Edward or under Elizabeth, was the work of the laity rather than of the clergy, of a subservient Parliament—selected for the purpose—rather than of convocation. This, as there is abundant evidence to prove, is even more true of the definite religious changes in the two last reigns referred to than of the schism under Henry VIII. Under Edward VI., as Abbot Gasquet and Mr. Bishop have shown (pages 279, 280), it was "the policy of the Catholic party in the episcopate, whether rightly or wrongly, to contest every inch of ground with the innovators," and to put "a Catholic, even if a strained interpretation upon what had been imposed on the Church by the law." Further, according to Dom Norbert Birt, in his "Elizabethan Religious Settlement," not only did the convocation of 1559, the last free convocation of the ancient English Church, make full and valiant profession of loyalty to the one Catholic faith and to the Vicar of Christ, but the Bishops in



Parliament, supported by many of the Catholic peers, true to their traditions as the upholders of ancient liberties against royal aggression, fought strenuously against the Act of Supremacy, which placed England once more in a state of schism, and against the Act of Uniformity, which imposed the new and heretical "Queen's religion." The latter act, indeed, was only carried in the upper house by a *majority of three votes* (page 90), the "infallible three," as they were called, the Bishops of Winchester and Lincoln having shortly before been sent to the Tower on an opportune charge of contumacy.

These Bishops, it may be well to remember, were of those who, under Henry and Edward, had fallen into schism, though not into formal heresy. Some allowance must, as Dom Norbert Birt says,<sup>1</sup> be made for human nature, and still more for the circumstances and conditions of the times. "A certain attitude of mind" must, moreover, as Abbot Gasquet and Mr. Bishop have pointed out, be taken into account, "which, however hard now to realize, was then a potent factor in determining men's conduct. Apart from the idea of the King as 'supreme lord,' even in matters of religion, the law, as the expression of the will of the nation, consecrated by the royal sanction, seemed to men like Gardiner and Tunstall to have a claim not merely on outward obedience, but even on conscience. . . . However overstrained and unreasonable an attitude of mind such as this may appear now, it was then a fact and must be reckoned with."<sup>2</sup> "Such ideas," the same authors continue (page 80), "were closely connected with a sentiment of which it is now equally difficult to realize the religious and the patriotic aspects. Men have now long been accustomed to the idea of a people divided in religion. In Edward's days such disunion must have appeared to all fatal to the unity of a nation which till then had been one in faith and practice. . . . It never entered into the calculations of those who initiated the changes in England that the new system was to embrace anything less than the whole people. . . . In Edward's reign the outcome of such principles was to induce those who held a public position to put the best interpretation possible upon every measure, however much they may have resisted its imposition and disliked its object." It may be said, therefore, that loyalty to a present ideal of unity in Church and State—a unity of over a thousand years' duration—was the means whereby loyalty to the larger, divine ideal of the One Church, the Church of all nations, was to be driven out of hearts and lives. So looked at, however, and taking into account all that tended to make the larger loyalty

<sup>1</sup> "Elizabethan Religious Settlement," p. 138.

<sup>2</sup> "Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer," p. 79.

difficult, all the circumstances that conspired to confuse the issues at stake, it becomes easy to understand how the new allegiance took the place of the old.

Of the readiness of so many of the clergy and laity to conform to the new religion under Elizabeth, Dom Norbert Birt, in the work already referred to, writes as follows: "The changes in belief and religious practice which had been witnessed in one generation (1535-1559)—therefore within the memory of persons of middle age in the year 1559—had been frequent in number, and had succeeded each other at close intervals of time. They could not but have proved bewildering to persons of less than extraordinary intelligence, hence men were so confused as hardly to know what to think, and, consequently, what to do for the best, both from a worldly and from a spiritual point of view. Some of the changes, too," he continues, "affected matters not of doctrine, but of discipline," matters that is, of ritual, the use of English in the public service of the Church and such like, which "did not, in their essence, imply a breach with Rome" (page 138).

"Many of the clergy, too," Father Birt adds, "who were buried in their country cures and had little or no converse with the outer world (and this applies still more to their parishioners)"—a state of affairs, it may be noted in passing, absolutely inconceivable at the present day—"were unlikely to be well acquainted with the latest phases of the many controversies that were then disturbing men's minds, . . . hence they could rarely have had the chance of understanding the true purport of the oaths they were suddenly called upon to take. . . . Such leaders as the Bishops, who had shewn a fearless front, and might have been to fight for the preservation of the old order, were removed; the flock, scattered, divided, left to their individual resources and individually confronted, succumbed. This is the true explanation," he concludes; "the only one that can reasonably account for facts otherwise wholly unaccountable" (page 139).

I dwell all the more strongly on this last word, as we may call it, of an English Catholic authority, one who stands, indeed, in the first rank among modern students of the Reformation period, in that I am writing for those whose ancestors endured, not a brief period, but three long centuries of persecution and martyrdom, with a patience and a heroism not surpassed in the annals of Christendom. But I would have them remember, at the same time, not only what the Catholic remnant in England underwent, but the special, deadly and insidious forms of persecution to which so many of them succumbed and from which, in the Providence of God, the Irish race were spared. They at least had never to choose between

national and religious unity; between loyalty to God and loyalty to King and country; were never called upon, by every motive of honor and patriotism, to fight against an Armada blessed by the Vicar of Christ; had never to face the charge that to be a "Papist" was to be an ally of the justly hated Spaniard and a traitor to England. Nor, again, were the Irish exposed to a more purely spiritual temptation—that, namely, of a vernacular liturgy, the outward forms and ceremonies of which remained, doubtless, long enough unchanged, outside the large cities, certainly, to make men lose sight of the fatal flaw, the schism that underlay a seemingly harmless change of custom. And whatever material losses the Irish had to bear under penal laws that are, and must ever remain, England's ineradicable shame, they escaped that which their English brethren suffered, the loss of those guides to whom, since the coming of S. Augustine, they had looked and whom they had followed. Lastly, to the Irish the new teachers were aliens and oppressors; to the English they came to appear as the true heirs and successors of those whose ancient titles they still bore, whose sees and rectories they held.

The contention, therefore, that England did not deny, but was robbed of her faith, may, on this evidence, and much more to the same effect, be taken as proved. It is a contention of vital importance as regards the movement we are considering, inasmuch as to this sense of violent oppression by the State, of the involuntary separation of "the Provinces of York and Canterbury" from "the rest of Catholic Christendom"—the expressions are their own—more, perhaps, than to any other cause, the revival of "Catholic" life in the Anglican communion, the return, as it is claimed to be, to a lost rather than to a deliberately forsaken position, ritual and doctrine, may be said to be due. And this because it lends strength to that consciousness of a quasi-corporate existence as a "Church," and some measure at least of plausibility to that claim of "continuity"—through spiritual affinity, State enactments to the contrary notwithstanding—with the pre-reformation *Ecclesia Anglicana*, which have been the inspiring and guiding principles of the Oxford Movement from the first; principles the true bearing and import of which are only now beginning to dawn on those who so passionately cling to them.

To discuss at any length the various measures and stages whereby the ancient "uses" of the English Church were replaced by a uniform "Book of Common Prayer," binding on all by act of Parliament, would take us too far from our present subject, though some reference to the principal changes will be made presently. It may, however, I think, be laid down as a general rule that all such rubrics,



articles and injunctions as are distinctively Protestant in tone and intention were imposed on the (schismatical) English Church, in Edward's reign especially—for Elizabeth merely revived and amplified them—by the sole authority of King and Parliament, against the will, though with the ultimate submission, as already shown, of the clergy in convocation. Further, that all such prayers and formularies as are capable of a Catholic interpretation—and they are very many—owe their place in the Book of Common Prayer chiefly to the conservative or "Catholic" party in both reigns, a party which may justly be characterized as intensely "national," squally opposed, under Elizabeth especially, to the "Popery" of Spain and to the ultra-protestantism of the continental "reformers." Not a little must, however, be attributed to Elizabeth's policy of making it possible, as she deemed and intended, for the whole nation to conform to her "ordering" of the national religion; of making Church and State synonymous and identical under the new conditions, as they had been under the old; under her supremacy in spirituals, as under "the usurped authority of the Bishops of Rome." And it is curious, to say the least, that the article on this point is worded to deny the Pope's claim to jurisdiction "in this *realm* of England," as if to exclude a temporal, while leaving a spiritual jurisdiction—should any be brave enough to draw so dangerous and "Jesuitical" a distinction. The result has been a typically English compromise not unlike the national tolerance of parliamentary and constitutional inconsistencies; an "Established Church," comprehensive of Puritans and "Catholics" alike, and a Book of Common Prayer—a manual of devotion, theology and canon law—to which all parties, High, Broad and Evangelical, appeal confidently in support of their contentions. But it may, further, be maintained that "germs of Popery," as they are called by a member of the last of these schools, are to be found in the Prayer Book, and that "of these," as he says, "the Catholic revival has been evolved." "*This witness is true.*" To some of these "germs," and to the forms into which they have grown of late, I purpose to return presently.

Meanwhile, it may be well to note here, as of immediate connection with our subject, the order in which, as it were, England lost the distinctive doctrines of the Catholic faith first preached to her by S. Augustine. The first to be discarded—the keystone, indeed, of the whole structure, as Henry soon learned—was that of the divinely constituted primacy of Peter and of his successors, the Vicars of Christ. The next, and inevitably that of the essential necessity of visible unity in communion with the Holy See, a necessity which only now the heirs of Henry's schism and Elizabeth's apostasy are beginning to realize. The doctrine of the communion

and of the invocation of saints, having all the strength of custom and habit and being interwoven with men's daily lives, was, we may fairly presume, more slowly lost sight of. Belief in some form of Real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament, even though the Mass as such was done away with by Edward and Elizabeth, would be kept alive, doubtless, by tradition, by personal devotion, by, one may say, its very naturalness and inevitability; by such of the ancient ceremonies as were allowed to survive the change from the old religion to the new, by the very prayers of "the office of Holy Communion." Belief—resting largely on national habits and instincts—in the corporate and continued existence of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*, in spite of State tyranny and altered conditions, was, as I have pointed out, not only maintained from the first as a fundamental, incontrovertible principle, but was and is the chief contention of the "Catholic" or "Church" party, alike in Edward's days and in our own. It would be difficult, indeed, if not impossible, to overestimate its importance. It has not only made the Oxford Movement what it is, but must necessarily shape and determine its ultimate issue. We have to deal, that is, with an entity which lays claim to be as truly a "Church" as do the schismatics of the East, and it is only, so far as it is possible to see, in its corporate form that any hope of a real "reunion" is to be looked for.

The brief domination of what may be termed Continental Protestantism under Edward VI., the Protestantism, that is, favored for personal reasons by Cranmer and the Protector Somerset, is of interest merely, so far as its influence can be traced in the new English liturgy, in the differences between the first Prayer Book of 1549 and the second of 1552. It was this latter and more Protestant book which was imposed on the nation by Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity in 1559, when "the Church of England, by law established," came into definite existence.

It is to this Book of Common Prayer—the Breviary, the Missal and the Manual of Devotion of millions of English-speaking people for over three centuries, a compilation, the linguistic beauty of which is only rivaled by the "King James" Bible and not surpassed by the Latin Offices of the Church—that we attribute justly that type of religious character best, perhaps, defined as "churchly;" which, while not in the strict sense Catholic, is most assuredly not Protestant in the ordinary acceptation of the term. If so, what is there, it may be asked, in the Book of Common Prayer to make such a type—and a very beautiful type it is—of spiritual character possible? To what "germs of Popery" must we ascribe the growth of virtues, doctrines, practices and, most of all, of lives "naturally Catholic?" And, since "it is the Mass that matters," since it is to

belief in the Mass that we attribute exclusively the distinguishing characteristics of the Catholic spiritual life, we are led to ask: Are there any traces of such belief—in the Real Presence, at least—to be found in the Anglican formularies?

In attempting to answer such a question in the affirmative, I must necessarily trespass on the patience of my readers with somewhat lengthy quotations and with such explanations as may seem to be required in order that there may be no misunderstanding as to their meaning and import. In so doing, moreover, I shall be dealing for the most part with those very "germs of Popery" referred to, from which unquestionably the "Catholic revival" of the present day has been evolved, thus bringing us to the sources and principles of that most wonderful "counter-reformation" which, surely and not slowly, is undoing the evil work of the sixteenth century.

In the year 1548, then, an "Order of Communion" was imposed on the schismatical, but not formally heretical English Church, by the ruling powers, which, however, "left the Latin Mass, according to the various rites hitherto in use in England, still intact. 'The varying of any rite or ceremony of the Mass,' up to and including the communion of the priest, is expressly forbidden by a rubric of this 'Order.'"<sup>3</sup> If, therefore, 1548 is to be taken as "the first and second year of Edward VI." specified by the "Ornaments Rubric"—to be referred to presently—this ordering of the traditional ceremonies, including obviously the vestments, is of supreme importance in considering the claim of the "Anglo-Catholics" that they are acting legally in their revival of ancient ritual and customs; that it is a revival, not an innovation; that the plain law of the "Church" is in their favor.

In this "Order," as in the first Prayer Book of 1549, the words of administration in "the Office of Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass," were practically, if not actually, those of the ancient offices. In the second Prayer Book of 1552 all reference to "the Body of Christ" at the time of administration is carefully and, no doubt, purposely omitted. The form now runs: "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving." At the ministering of the chalice: "Drink this in remembrance that Christ's Blood was shed for thee, and be thankful." In the Prayer Book ordered by the Act of Uniformity in 1559, Elizabeth, in pursuance of her policy of comprehension, of making it possible for Calvinists and Papists—as she doubtless deemed—to accept her new religion, caused both forms, the Catholic and the Zwinglian, to be combined as they remain to this day. It is permissible, therefore, so far as these

---

<sup>3</sup> "Edward VI.," p. 90.



particular words go, for an Anglican to hold either the doctrine of the Church on this vital point or that of Geneva.

Other portions of the Communion Office are capable of a like ambiguous interpretation. Of the "prayer of humble access," as it is called, which I am about to quote, it may be well to state that in the Prayer Book of 1549 it is ordered to be said, kneeling before the altar, *after* the consecration, but that on Bishop Gardiner's pointing to it as an act of adoration it was placed in the second Prayer Book immediately *before* the prayer of consecration.<sup>4</sup> The words to which I wish to call particular attention are these: "Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son, and to drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most Precious Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us."

The Rev. J. H. Blunt, a standard Anglican authority, says justly, in his "Annotated Book of Common Prayer," of these words that "the emphatic sense of '*so* to eat' must not be overlooked." It is in this sense of "*so* to eat that we may attain the grace of union with Christ," that the prayer has been of vital import in the formation of the Anglican religious character. It is in this sense, moreover, that we must take account of it as the life-principle of that belief in the Real Presence, in a true "Holy Communion" which has never been lost in the Anglican "Church;" has, indeed, been more widely prevalent and of greater spiritual efficacy than can ever be known till the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed; has been the true spring and source of the "Catholic" revival, as it is its only possible source. For if we consider it rightly, who may begin to measure the spiritual effects of such a prayer in those to whom the "Church of England" was and is the True Church of God; to whom this maimed, imperfect rite has been and is the only "Holy Communion" of which they know anything?

But it is round the "Ornaments Rubric," that is, on questions of ritual as symbolical of doctrine, that controversy in the Anglican communion has raged most fiercely since the formal beginnings of the Oxford Movement. The "Order of Communion" issued in 1548 left, as has been shown, the ancient and accustomed ritual of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* intact and unaltered, forbade, indeed, any attempt to change it. The first Prayer Book of 1549 introduced no very marked changes, professedly or officially at all events, nor presumably did the second book of 1552, in matters of ritual as of obligation. The Elizabethan Act of Uniformity, at all events, prescribed that "the Ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof"—the vestments, evidently; compare the French word "*ornements*" as

<sup>4</sup> "Edward VI.," p. 290.

still commonly used in this technical sense—"shall be retained and be in use, as were in this Church of England . . . in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI." This rubric was again imposed at the final revision of the Prayer Book in 1661.

Of this ritual injunction the returned Protestant exiles had this to say at the time of its imposition: "The last Book of Service (1552) is gone through with the proviso to retain the ornaments which were used in the first and second year of King Edward. Our gloss upon the text is that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others"—the extreme "reformers," presumably—"in the meantime shall not convey them away."<sup>5</sup>

The contemporary expression, "*first and second year of King Edward*," is worth noting. Edward came to the throne in January, 1546-1547, according to the then method of beginning the year on March 25. The "first and second year," then, would be 1547-1548, the latter being that which saw the issue of the "Order of Communion" (April 1, 1548), enjoining, under penalties, the use of the full ancient ritual of the English Church. As to the modifications and legal interpretations which this "interpretation clause of the ritual law of the Church of England," as Mr. Blunt calls it, has undergone, I would refer my readers to that author's learned preface to his "Annotated Book of Common Prayer" (pp. lxx., 599). What is of more immediate connection with our present subject is the view taken of it by the gentleman to whom we are indebted for the phrase "germs of Popery." Under date of April 4, 1899, he writes to the *English Churchman* as follows: "They (the 'Romanizers') appeal to that book (the Prayer Book) with its 'ornaments rubric,' and claim, most plausibly, that it prescribes their Romish 'ornaments of the Church and Ministers,' the Mass vestments, and, as a corollary, the Mass!" This writer, at least, is under no illusion as to the real significance of the ritual revival brought about by the Oxford counter-reformation, a revival which only those who have seen it can estimate at anything approaching its scope and importance, which, indeed, only a series of illustrations and an array of facts and figures could convey to those not so familiar. Nor has the gentleman any doubt as to the part which symbols play in religious life and in the dissemination of doctrines and ideas. The Mass vestments, as he says, connote the Mass, as truly as a flag connotes a country or a victory. It is easy, therefore, to understand why the battle of the counter-reformation has been waged, apparently, over "externals." It is because the externals have a certain definite, unmistakable meaning. As he refers to other "germs of Popery," it may be as well to finish the quotation from his letter. "They

---

<sup>5</sup> "Elizabethan Religious Settlement," p. 92.

assert," he continues, "from the pulpit. the platform and in the press that priestly absolution is the doctrine of the Prayer Book, and that the Sacrament of Penance is not alien to its teaching; and they quote passage after passage in support of their pretensions."

While on this subject, and if my readers will excuse the somewhat lengthy quotations already alluded to, it may be well to note the official teaching, the written *lex credendi*, as distinct from the *lex orandi*, of the Anglican communion. In the catechism—to be found in the Book of Common Prayer, and learned by all English churchmen—a sacrament is defined as being "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same (the grace), and a pledge to assure us thereof." It is an effectual means, then, whereby we receive the grace it is intended by Our Lord to convey, *ex opere operato*, if words have any significance—"a pledge to assure us thereof." Bearing this in mind, let us see what is said concerning "the inward part, or thing signified, in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." This is declared to be: "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Here the word open to misconstruction, to a Protestant, rather than to a Catholic interpretation, is, of course, "faithful," since it seems to imply that the receiving of Christ's Body and Blood, "verily and indeed," depends on the faith of the communicant, *ex opere operantis*. Interpreted, however, in the sense of "whereby we receive," of the prayer, "*so to eat*," and of the distinction, made by S. Thomas, between *sacramentum* and the *res et virtus sacramenti*, between fruitful and unfruitful, a worthy and an unworthy communion, it is evident that the definition—whatever the real intention of its framers—is legitimately capable of being understood in an orthodox sense. That it is so interpreted, the growth of devotion to "the Blessed Sacrament" among Anglicans, and its effects in their lives, not of late years only, but to be traced here and there during the three centuries of schism and heresy, is more than sufficient evidence. It is, if I may refer to the matter again, the inevitable and natural outcome of the faith nourished by the "Prayer of Humble Access."

But if both the *lex orandi* and the *lex credendi*, contained in the Book of Common Prayer, favor the traditional "Catholic" or churchly view of the Blessed Sacrament of the altar, the so-called "Black Rubric," at the end of the Communion Office, seems to support the opposite, or Zwinglian view. In regard to kneeling at Holy Communion, "it is here declared," the rubric states, "that thereby no adoration is intended or ought to be done either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received"—Query: To



the accidents?—"or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood"—*in specie sua*? "For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very Natural Substances"—this is the hardest word to interpret or to explain away—"and therefore may not be adored . . . and the Natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here"—again, *in specie sua*?—"it being against the truth of Christ's Natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."

Concerning this declaration Blunt says, in his reference to it, that "it was first added to the Communion Office at the final revision in 1661," at the time, that is, when "peace at any price" was the chief aim of the authorities in Church and State. There can be no question, however, that it marks a victory for the Puritan Conformists of the Restoration, whom it was the policy of Charles II. to conciliate in religious as in constitutional matters; the former, indeed, being in his estimation of far the less importance, and therefore to be the more readily conceded. It marks, also, the influence of Cranmer, who was responsible for its original framing in 1552. One very important change was, however, made in it, doubtless through the instrumentality of the High Churchmen of the latter period referred to—namely, 1661. Cranmer, who was, it must be remembered, a scholastic theologian and knew the significance of every word used, framed the declaration to deny any "real or essential" presence of "Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood." For this the revisers in 1661 substituted "corporal presence." Thus, Blunt concludes, "they retained the protest against Transubstantiation, while they removed all risk of the Declaration . . . being misunderstood as even an apparent denial of the truth of the Real Presence."

This, it may be well to state, is the deliberate profession of a representative of the earlier Tractarians, who were distinctively Anglican and in many respects "anti-Roman," followers of the *via Media*. They held, so they maintained, to the older, patristic, pre-Tridentine doctrine of "the Undivided Church," and refused to attempt a definition of the mode of Christ's presence in the Blessed Sacrament. "Faith believes," wrote Newman, "nor questions how." For men not bound by the infallible dogmatic decisions of the Church, it is a perfectly lawful, as it is a perfectly reasonable attitude. "The Presence is real," they taught; "this is My Body." For them that was and is enough.

How, then, can "Anglo-Romans," as they call themselves, the present day leaders of the counter-reformation, teach, as they do, the Tridentine doctrine of Transubstantiation, notwithstanding the "Black Rubric?" As a personal explanation, from my own experience, if I may be allowed to refer to it, I would say that faith, when

it lays hold of a man's heart and soul, rises above mere definitions, above contrary ones most of all. "*Cor ad cor loquitur*," the Heart of Christ speaks to the heart of man, and there is no more doubt. Next, and more generally, I would say that the declaration in question was imposed on the "Church" by the State, is part of the burden of her "unwilling bondage," and consequently, as we have seen in the case of Gardiner and Tunstall, in respect to the Edwardine changes, is looked upon as a statement, probably heretical, to be interpreted as widely as possible, "saving the teaching of the Catholic Church," as Lord Halifax said, in reference to other Anglican dogmatic decisions. Moreover, as I have ventured to suggest, when quoting the words of the declaration, the definition of S. Thomas, *in specie sua*, may—or so it seems to a layman unfamiliar with theology—possibly afford a solution of the difficulty.

I would point out, further, since the fact remains that the doctrine is held and taught by Anglicans, that, as Mr. Spencer Jones says, in the introduction to his "England and the Holy See" (pp. xvii., xviii.): "In regard to transubstantiation, there is a statement of the doctrine by Cardinal Manning, to be found on page 31, volume II. of his life, which differs in absolutely nothing from the doctrine of the Real Presence as taught by accredited English (Anglican) divines." This, it is hardly necessary to insist, is of the utmost interest and importance, and only goes to show the importance of an accurate statement of doctrine, as it also shows how often real agreement underlies verbal differences arising from the lack of just such accuracy of definition. There is also a note, in which Mr. Jones quotes from Cardinal Newman's essay on the *via Media* in relation to the same subject. It is of too purely theological nature to be discussed here, but the terms of agreement, which make it possible for an Anglican to accept the Tridentine doctrine as not contrary to that of his own communion, may be said briefly to consist in the value given to such words as "natural" and "sacramental," "real" and "spiritual," the values that is given to them by the Angelic Doctor. How much is here gained there is surely no need to enlarge upon.

In respect, further, to the other "germs of Popery" above enumerated, absolution and the Sacrament of Penance, that is, to the authority of the apostolic priesthood and the power of the keys, the Book of Common Prayer is unquestionably, so far as words go, on the side of the "Romanizers," and a source of weakness—again as far as words go—to their "evangelical" fellow-churchmen. In the preface to the Ordinal we read that: "It is evident . . . that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests and Deacons. . . ."

And therefore *to the intent that these orders may be continued* (italics mine) and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England," the ensuing Ordinal is declared obligatory to validity and legality.

Here again we must, in common fairness to our Anglican brethren, distinguish between this deliberate and carefully worded purpose of *continuing the ancient orders* of Bishops, priests and deacons, a declaration which, taken in its plain and literal sense—as they have a perfect right to do—they regard as the true mind and purpose of their "Church," and any state enactments which may seem, in one way or another, to modify or invalidate it. Still less can we allow that its force and authority, so far as they are concerned, are lessened by Elizabeth's taking upon herself to validate the new orders by her own act and power. The twenty-sixth Article of Religion, as Blunt points out (page 536), "drawn up in 1562 and confirmed by convocation, 1571"—this is of vital import, as indicating the ecclesiastical action of the new "Church"—"had already decreed the validity of all orders conferred according to the new Ordinal since the second year of Edward VI." Elizabeth's declaration, therefore, merely gave the official sanction, and added the royal authority of the "Supreme Governor" to the decision of convocation, and made dispute or denial of the orders in question, whether by Papist or Calvinist, an offense against "the Queen's Majesty," with fitting penalties. The method of procedure had its advantages under the circumstances.

Again, the same author (*loc. cit.*) draws attention to a fact—easily capable of proof or disproof—which may fairly weigh more with them than with us, and, most of all, with those who are striving for corporate reunion with the See of Peter, while clinging passionately to a belief in the validity of their own orders. "Courayer," he writes, "mentions the important fact that Pope Pius IV., by his envoy, offered to confirm the whole English Prayer Book, of course including the Ordinal, provided the Church of England would be reconciled to the Pope and acknowledge his supremacy. Ch. xiii., p. 235." Now, the bull *Apostolicae Curae* of Leo XIII. pronounced Anglican orders "absolutely null and void," as being defective "in matter and form," but it is surely open to a devout Anglican to hope that some successor of Paul IV. and of Leo XIII. may yet validate Anglican orders by sanctioning the changes made in the ancient ordinal.

The actual "form" used at the ordination of a priest is as follows: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His holy sacraments."



No power of sacrifice, it has been contended, which is of the very essence of the Catholic priesthood, is here either alluded to or conveyed, hence the fatal defect of both matter and form. Setting aside any arguments that might be drawn from Oriental and even from ancient Roman ordinals, we must once more, in common fairness, give all the weight possible to the Anglican interpretation of the words as they stand, if we would realize why they maintain in good faith, and with so much earnestness, the Catholic validity of their orders. Blunt's note at this point (page 563) is, therefore, of special interest. "All sacerdotal power," he writes, "is derived from the Holy Ghost; the Church, therefore, holds that the reception of the Holy Ghost is necessary to constitute a Christian priest, and that this gift can be conferred only through the hands of a Bishop." As to the words themselves—and in the original Edwardine ordinal they were taken *verbatim* from those in the Gospel, the fuller form being added after a considerable period—he adds: "Being the very words employed by Our Lord when He ordained His Apostles, they are the original Charter of the institution of the Ministry, from which alone the limits and extent of its authority are to be known." This may, I think, be taken as the view of those who, so to speak, appeal to Scripture and antiquity as against "later Roman assumptions of authority," and who regard this "original form," the form used by Christ Himself, as sufficiently connoting all that the Church Catholic has ever understood as being "the office and work of a priest in the Church of God." It is, at all events, a perfectly reasonable view—apart always from the divinely given authority of the Vicar of Christ, to whom alone it belongs to decide what is and what is not a valid form of ordination to that priesthood of which, as of the kingdom of heaven, he holds the key.

Lastly, as to the Sacrament of Penance, which, with the power of sacrifice, has been entrusted to the apostolic ministry. In the Order for the Visitation of the Sick the following rubric occurs: "*Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession, the Priest shall absolve him . . . after this sort:* Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offenses; and by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." The authority here referred to is, of course, that professedly conveyed by ordination, and since it extends to "all sinners," there is justice in the claim of those who, like Lord Halifax, contend that absolution is as necessary to sinners in health as to sinners in sickness. There

can, at least, be no doubt that sacramental absolution is not contrary to the plain purpose and teaching of the Book of Common Prayer.

How comes it, then, one may ask, that with the last of the Non-Jurors of the Bishops and clergy who, while resisting the unconstitutional demands of their lawful sovereign, James II., refused allegiance to the usurper, William of Orange, the churchly, or Catholic party in the Anglican communion may be said practically to have ceased to exist? The reason assigned by an editorial in the *Living Church* of July 4, 1908, seems the most probable, if not, indeed, humanly speaking, the only one—the triumph, namely, of the Puritan conformists of 1661 and the following years. It is pointed out that at the restoration of the Stuarts large numbers of Presbyterian ministers were allowed to continue in their livings on condition of accepting Anglican ordination. "The Church," this writer continues, "was swamped by a number of clergy who had been made priests without wishing to be anything more than Presbyterian ministers. These merely tolerated conformists became the administrators of the Church, and barely tolerated the historic (High Anglican) conception of the Church. . . . When the old-time Churchly spirit began to reassert itself, in the middle of the nineteenth century, it was treated as an unwarrantable novelty, an usurpation from an alien communion ("Rome"), a monstrosity within the Church of England."

No better summary of the history of Anglicanism from 1660 to 1833 could, I venture to say, be given than this. It explains all that otherwise might seem inexplicable in a communion which had deliberately retained in its formularies, its legislation and its eternal organization, so much that was certainly more Catholic than Protestant, as all later history shows. It explains, also, the storm of opposition, misapprehension, hatred and calumny wherewith the "Catholic Revival" was met in its beginnings, the violence of which may be gathered from contemporary accounts of the movement.

For the state of religion in England during the eighteenth century, I would refer my readers to such works as the "Life of Whitefield," of the two Wesleys, including Macaulay's Essay, and to Froude's "Oxford Counter-Reformation," among many others. The spiritual life of the nation was, to all appearance, dead; even the Catholic remnant, as Lingard and others have recorded, was not immune from the blight of worldliness and indifference which, more than all else, marks the Hanoverian period.

Yet, cold and irreligious as England had become, she was to show that she had not lost all the qualities with which her ancient faith had endowed her. The exiled Bishops, priests and religious of Revolutionary France found ready and ungrudging welcome in a

country whose penal laws against her own "Popish recusants" were in full force. The effects of this hospitality on the religious life of the nation are not easily to be measured. For one thing, they made the Oxford Movement possible.

Its immediate causes must, however, be sought in the political rather than in the distinctly religious conditions of the times. The Reform Act of 1832 had given an impulse to Liberalism, at which the Tories, mindful of the French Revolution and having the troubles of 1830 under their eyes, literally stood aghast. Liberalism of all kinds, it may be well to remember, was, to Newman and his friends, as it is to many of us, of the devil simply *et sans phrase*. But it was the Irish Temporalities Bill, passed in 1833, suppressing half the Irish Protestant episcopate, which really started the counter-reformation, since the very life of the National Church seemed to be at stake. On July 14 of that year Keble preached at S. Mary's, Oxford, his memorable sermon on "The National Apostasy." Newman in after years says of it: "I have ever considered and kept the day as the start of the Religious Movement of 1833."<sup>6</sup>

Into the history of the movement itself it is not my purpose to enter here. I desire rather to draw attention, in conclusion, to its latest phase, the Anglo-Roman, or Reunion party, which may be said to have come into existence with the present century and is best represented by the *Lamp* and by Mr. Spencer Jones' "England and the Holy See: An Essay Towards Reunion." This reunion—the very word is full of import—must, these heirs of the counter-reformation, of the "Anglican" tradition, maintain, be a "corporate" submission of the "English Church" to the Vicar of Christ, even as the separation was, in their view of it, the "corporate," though unwilling, act of the *Ecclesia Anglicana*. More, it is the divine *terminus ad quem*, the only possible destiny of the Oxford Movement.

It is a movement, moreover, which may be said to have only just begun, the true value and import of which its very leaders have hardly yet fully grasped. It is a position which, to a Catholic, seems wholly illogical and untenable. Why, it may be asked, do they not submit individually to the Pope, whose primacy and infallibility they acknowledge?

The answer must, I think, be sought, first, in that very sense of a corporate existence as a "Church;" in that belief in the "continuity," the identity, between the pre-reformation *Ecclesia Anglicana* and their own communion. This sense and this belief, while they are the vital principles of the Oxford Movement, while they have had, and must continue to have, divinely logical and inevitable effects, have not as yet attained the full measure of them. The conscious-

---

<sup>6</sup> "Apologia pro vita sua," p. 35.



ness of corporate existence must, it would seem, entail an ever clearer realization of isolation from "the rest of Catholic Christendom," as they say, of separation from that Divine centre of Catholic life and unity whose claims they are willing to recognize after three centuries of bitter repudiation and denial. The very belief in "continuity" must, in like measure, bring, in God's time, a full sense of the differences between the Church of the English people and the "Church of England," a full understanding of what—by their own admission—has been lost, and how, alone—again by their own admission—it can be regained.

But the answer to our question must be sought, secondly, and no less surely, in that conviction as to the validity of their orders, and, consequently, of their sacraments, which is founded not merely on the wording and professed intention of their formularies, but on their spiritual experience. Their communions, they will tell us, have been real, and, therefore, sacramental, clear proofs of validity; to deny their reality would be to deny, to blaspheme the work of God in their souls. How shall we persuade them that the graces given were real, were even attached to and dependent on the faithful reception of their rites, and yet in no sense sacramental? That the test of spiritual experience in this matter, even if it seems to amount to a *probabile argumentum*, to an actual proof of Our Lord's presence,<sup>7</sup> is not a proof of His sacramental presence; that it is of equal application to devout Methodists, Presbyterians and others, who lay no claim to the possession of valid orders? That it is, simply, the reward of good faith?

If, however, the sense of corporate existence and the claim to "continuity" with the ancient Church of the English people have not as yet worked out to their logical consequences, if belief in the validity of their orders and sacraments still holds so many back from a submission which, to us, is clearly of inevitable obligation, there can be no question for those who have studied the movement in all its phases as to its ultimate outcome. That outcome is, I am convinced, none other than the *terminus ad quem* which the leaders of the movement have come to recognize as divinely ordered—Reunion, the corporate submission of the Anglican communion to the Holy See. Such submission, such reunion, these leaders assert and repeat, is the only possible goal of the Oxford Movement, without which it has no justification, no meaning. It will be said that such a submission is impossible, inconceivable. Is it more impossible or less conceivable than that of the Arians? Is not the whole movement something wholly new, strange and unaccountable, this deliberate return of a schismatical, heretical body towards Catholic unity,

---

<sup>7</sup> Imit. IV., xix., 2.

except as the work of God, a progress towards just such an end? The Church lost England—that is what it amounts to—in the open revolt of the sixteenth century, and that loss was, humanly speaking, brought about by the Anglican communion. Is it not natural—if one may say so—to look to the Anglican communion as God's instrument—however imperfect it may seem to us—in making good the loss? How else—so far as we can see—shall Our Lady's Dowry be restored to her?

But if this is so, what is our attitude to be towards such a movement, one which, it cannot be too strongly insisted on, is of vital import to the Church, in English-speaking countries especially? These exiles from the heritage that was once their—exiles, be it always remembered, through no fault of their own—are turning their eyes, their longings, their steps more definitely than ever before towards the fold to which, in heart and desire, they have always rightly belonged. They are learning—some have already learned—that only by submission to the shepherd appointed by Christ to rule His flock on earth can they attain entrance to the shelter of His one fold. They have come to believe, some less fully, indeed, some in full measure, as we believe, to pray as we pray, to seek, in maimed, imperfect rites, that sacramental union with Himself which He longs to grant to them and to us. And so far they are in the valley of shadows and the mists of illusion; there is a wall between them and us, a wall of misunderstandings, of inherited estrangement, which neither they nor we, but our common fathers, built up between us, but for which they and we shall answer before God if we do not labor to remove it.

Yet surely, with a common faith, common hope, a common fellowship—however partial or imperfect—with Him who is the One Shepherd of all His sheep, whose last prayer on the night of His bitter Passion was that they might all be one, “that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me,” the barrier that divides us grows transparent and will vanish ere we know it, like the mist at sunrise. Then, and then only, will the Oxford Movement have fulfilled the task appointed to it, have attained the destiny which, in its very sources, in the very formularies of the communion it has quickened to new life, God intended and marked out as its ultimate and only possible issue. Then shall the Good Shepherd's own promise be kept at last: “And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also must I bring, and they shall hear My voice, and there shall be One Fold and One Shepherd.”

FRANCIS W. GREY.

Ottawa, Canada.

## ANARCHISM IN INDIA AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

THE murder of Sir Curzon Wylie brought home to the door of the supreme power a condition of affairs in India either disregarded in England or lightly or contemptuously regarded. It was very well known among the officials in that great dependency that disaffection led now and then to murder by the knife or the revolver, by the wrecking of trains or by bomb-throwing; and that this or that method of evincing discontent, though limited in operation, was not confined to the assassins, but represented the passions and hopes of associations if not of "classes."<sup>1</sup> All this time constitutional reforms were in progress, and not merely associations, but the "classes," into which for the purpose of political discrimination all above the ryots or tillers of the soil were labeled, believed that the reforms were due to those acts of violence.

That this was an unfortunate conclusion may be easily admitted; that it was a natural one to the Eastern mind, those acquainted with the subtle and treacherous disposition of the Indian races, especially of the most intelligent race among them, the Bengalis, will at once conclude. Gratitude has no place in the East, justice has no meaning; fear or interest is the only intelligible motive in administration as it is in the relations of private life. The only part of the Indian people that can be reckoned on as attached to the government and its "foreign" officials is the tiller of the soil; and with him it is the stern teaching of experience, for he knows that the native landlord and the native tax-gatherer are greedy and heartless to a proverb, while the English collector is just and compassionate. The latter steps in on complaint between the tenant and the native landlord, and sees that the tenant shall only pay what the law itself provides—namely, an equitable rent in proportion to the produce of the year. It is right to add that tenants will only apply to the English official in extreme cases when utter misery from the exactions of the native landlord gives them the courage of despair.

That some automatic and constant protection to tenants should be contrived to render it unnecessary to apply to the English officials against the landlords will be conceded when one knows the hopeless condition of the tenants in a quarrel with the former. The law is excellent, but in their dealings with the tenants the landlords are above and outside the law, except in those desperate cases when the authority of the English collector is invoked. The tenant, destitute of means, submits to any demand rather than apply to the English

---

<sup>1</sup> The word "classes," like the phrase "babu clerks," has a local Anglo-Indian application.



official. With time he is in hopeless arrears; there are two consequences, starvation or eviction. The landlord is anxious to get possession of the land to work it for his own immediate profit. The tenant may become a laborer without any longer the conditional ownership the law had given him or seek subsistence elsewhere. The strange circumstance in connection with this mischief is that the tenants in some mysterious way blame the government and not their own countrymen for all the consequences; but the sentiment is artificial, as I shall presently point out, produced by the agitators, in fact.

It may be objected that such a state of feeling could hardly be produced by the agitators if the ryots fully realized their indebtedness to the imperial government for the admirable land legislation which conferred on them a perpetual interest in the soil, subject to the payment of rent when the zamindars were intermediate landlords between them and the State, and to the land tax where the State was the immediate landlord. The ryots, in truth, are aware of what the imperial government has done for them, and it can be safely said they would not wish to be transferred from the English possessions to those of the great fundatories of the Crown, much as the glamor of immemorial dignity and descent invests these princes in their eyes.

I briefly pass from the consideration that the contempt evinced by the imperial race for all classes of the natives, including the wealthy commercial class and landholders of the most ancient ancestry and great possessions, makes a difficulty. I shall notice it more in detail later on. What I wish to do is to clear the ground in the beginning by a statement which may cause astonishment to the American reader and to the Irish politician, who looks on English rule everywhere outside the great self-governing colonies as an unmitigated despotism.

This certainly is not the case in India. The land laws are excellent. When the administration of them is oppressive—and it is that most frequently to a frightful extent—the native landlords and native magistrates and deputy collectors are the cause. There is a greater degree of local self-government in the four great provinces called the Presidencies and the Central Provinces, the latter under one Governor and his lieutenants, than in English counties before the last education act. No doubt the ryots are not represented in the Provincial Councils. Eighty years ago Manchester did not send a representative to Parliament, while some petty village, with its electorate of the parson, the parish clerk and the squire's gate-keeper, sent two. Old Sarum, I think, was something like this.

The famines in India have naturally enough stirred the hearts of

humane men and very seriously occupied the judgment of sincere Radicals, who look at results not like the Doctrinaires, who adhere to theories whatever be the results. These gentlemen of Bentham's leading in the science of government and of Mills' abstractions in the principles of legislation remind one of the old physicians laughed at by Moliere, whom even death did not convince that extreme weakness was not to be cured by blood-letting and powerful purgatives. The patients were criminal, that was all about it, for they chose to die in defiance of the rules of science. Now we have the theory of the Doctrinaire-Radicals of Bentham's lead and Mills that India should be governed by a constitution like that of the United Kingdom, plus an electorate of every man and woman of good character. Well, good character is a relative term. When the probability that every man in India is a thief when he can,<sup>2</sup> a liar always, a perjurer when his evidence needs deflection from the truth, I find it hard to call him a person of good character. As to the ladies, a Sikh military chief the other day declared that if English rule were driven from India not one article of value would be found in any house within a week, not a virgin would be found throughout the British provinces or possibly in the native States. If the Zenana did not secure an Indian's wives and daughters, I can hardly think that female suffrage and the excitement of an election to the Indian Parliament would contribute to character. Contested elections are not fair or honest, but women should be both; therefore they have no business with the suffrage in India.

The other alternative is practical, but an anachronism—namely, a despotism with the stern qualities of Orientalism as seen in the ancient monarchies, tempered by the patriarchal form commonly called paternal government. Such was the rule of the English in Ireland in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, such the rule of Russia in Poland according to Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, when Dukes were royal incubi planted on the earnings and destitution of the masses and before Duchesses became gracious ladies with a monopoly of the virtues which are crowns to their husbands. In fact, the right honorable gentleman's political psychology, since as Colonial Secretary he superseded the Foreign Secretary and took up empire-making as an industry has risen to Bismarckian heights. Like the "Imps"<sup>3</sup> in Great Britain, he would establish a despotism in India, but, mind you, it should be an enlightened despot that filled what Richard III. called the chair. Can an enlightened despot be found anywhere save Birmingham?

---

<sup>2</sup> I am not speaking of the native princes and the gentlemen in the provinces who have grown up and lived among the British officials.

<sup>3</sup> Liberal Imperialists.

Possibly the Civil Service, so far as it is represented by the high-minded gentlemen from Ireland, England and Scotland, may be considered an enlightened despotism in the aggregate. But they are described as rather haughty to the natives, while their judicial and executive action is above all praise. I understand that the military men sometimes deputed to discharge magisterial functions follow the rules laid down by the vice regal and presidential councils. These rules are mindful of the susceptibilities of the natives so far as the claims of impartial justice, but from what I learn even now and what I learned in my young days from gentlemen who had served, there is a tone of superiority over wealthy and well-born Indians which rankles. The assumption may have been forced in early days by the duplicity and Uriah Heap humility of the Bengalis. They fawned, but woe to the army man or the civilian whom extravagance placed in their power. They were, in his trouble, taking satisfaction for the innumerable times they bowed to the earth and shaded their eyes before the Sahib.

The enlightened despot may do in a polity of the imagination. History does not produce him in the aggregate as an Athenian or Venetian republic or in the individual like that superb actor, Augustus. In spite of Gibbon I fail to find the impartial justice I should look for, say in Tragan, with his sham forms of trial, and that a marked Patrician or knight that is an eques died without a trial, as though Caligula wanted a sensation or Nero desired to be his heir. I think, therefore, Edward, Emperor of India, cannot be made absolute in India as Mr. Disraeli's followers seemed to have thought possible.

I have hinted that the sentiments of returned officers were those, in my young days, of men who looked upon the Indians as simply a population without rights.<sup>4</sup> To a very considerable extent even now the successors of these gentlemen carry this social and political estimate home with them. "Shoot them down!" is an expression employed with reference to excited meetings of the people in England or Ireland by your Anglo-Indian. Now I can hardly think such ferocity is indigenous in England, though Mr. A. Balfour as Irish Secretary telegraphed to a police officer in Ireland: "Don't hesitate to shoot!" It was Napoleonic. "Shoot the burgomaster," writes Napoleon to one of his generals. Unrestrained power is not a good thing for those who may feel its exercise. The Radicals of England stood against its exercise in Ireland in 1865. I remember the incident well. The class of honorable men to which Mr. Balfour belongs—yes, the Tories are all honorable men, widely extended branches of the great house of Barnacle; all honorable men, just as

---

<sup>4</sup> Even to-day the native is spoken of as an "outsider."



honorable as when they lived upon the three kingdoms, as officials whose subordinates did the work at a tenth or a fifth of the salaries, as sinecurists who did not pretend to do work, as pensioners whose term of work was short and joyous as a midsummer night's dream—I say that that aristocratic, territorial, ecclesiastical class demanded that Sir Hugh Rose should be sent over to Ireland that year to play the part he had played in India. A weak-kneed Whig administration was in power, but Manchester, Birmingham, the Midlands were against the class of honorable men who wanted Indian methods in Ireland, because three or four enthusiasts started a newspaper to overthrow English power in Ireland. If this class would be so masterful at home, at the very heart of the empire, one can possibly understand that their relatives would be insolent and despotic in India. During the height of the land war in Ireland retired army men settled in England were pretty constantly advertising in the newspapers for agencies of estates. Among their qualifications honesty, the security of bonds, experience of the work, skill in dealing with different orders of men and so on were not mentioned. The advertiser had served in India, had been accustomed there to deal with lawless, seditious, rebellious natives, whom he had kept in awe, and was consequently the man for a disturbed district in Ireland.<sup>5</sup> These little touches and more from personal knowledge I could give must help me to discern wherein lies the probabilities between the rose-color of my fellow Radicals and the fire and brimstone of the class which rendered government in India the detestation of Indians by their encouragement to the insolent demeanor and oppressive usages of the army men and magistrates of the uncovenanted kind of British origin, the engineer's clerks who pride themselves on their white skins, as Noah Claypole bragged over "Work'us," as he called *Oliver Twist*, and the commercial men of Calcutta, who think they are the East India Company resuscitated. I have already drawn a distinction between the Civil Service officials and all other kinds of men serving in India. In connection with this body, the like of which is not to be found in history, a reckless purpose seems to be descending on English reformers at home and panic-stricken officials of rank and experience in India, whose condition of terror seems to indicate an unconfessed sense that the United Kingdom's tenure of India is unstable as a rope of sand. It is proposed to confer the Civil Service appointments on the natives, possibly by examination as to a certain extent they are now open—

---

<sup>5</sup> My countrymen are not fools. The English "goneer"—so they called a fellow kicked out of employment for drunkenness or something that could not be overlooked, say, forging a friend's name or obtaining money or goods under false pretenses—failed to recommend himself to Irish landlords. They preferred the devils they knew to the devils from India.

to confer them, I say, to such an extent as to exclude candidates from the United Kingdom. On the other hand, the idea is to stop the reforms and to deprive the natives of all administrative and such modified legislative power as the Councils possess and to make the Viceroy an irresponsible ruler, subject to the shadowy authority of the Secretary for India. In other words, to make him "an enlightened despot."

"Hastings, the lieutenant of a British monarch, claiming absolute dominion!" exclaimed Burke. Such an idea was a paradox in the eighteenth century, but what is it to-day, when events have marched to an infinite distance from the fierce, lawless, uncontrolled aggressions of that period? Fortunately the leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords knows his India as his party does not, and between him and Lord Morley a way out of the difficulty will be found safe to the empire and just to the natives.

It would seem clear, however, that the spreading anarchism must be put down in a manner to show that no example from the rise of Japan, that the invincibility of the West is a thing of the past can be relied upon, for the power that established a rule over India which no invader had accomplished is stronger to-day than ever. That this lesson may be insisted upon with far less difficulty than may be supposed may be concluded from the effect produced by the deportation of the Bengali editors. The outrages were stopped, a fact which proves that the awe of the supreme power is still a great influence; and then there is the rather uncomfortable inference that the outrages were inspired by political associations instead of being the isolated deeds of fanatics, as some optimists inform us.

Patriotism is a motive all men respect, but it should be expressed by methods that the conscience of mankind approves of. Assassination, whether in England or India, is not the path to redress. The justification of Dinghra read in the police court after he murdered Sir Curzon Wylie and the Indian gentleman by his side reads like a page from the manifesto of some martyr giving up his life for a sacred cause which was the passion of his life. If Dinghra were not insane—and it appears he was not—a murderer using the language of a lover of liberty while his hands were red with the blood of his own countryman, accidentally the companion of the destined victim, and the destined victim himself conspicuous among the many humane and generous friends of India employed in the service of the Crown, is in the last degree that sort of mental product which revolts the moral sense while it paralyzes the understanding. If you look at him as one rendered morbid by reflections of a dark and gloomy cast, the analysis is not satisfactory; you can only find the history intelligible when you regard him as a unit in a movement to

advance which sensational crime is a means. It may be called fanaticism, but if there be many fanatics of the kind, society must defend itself or surrender to the law of the dagger. There is something almost grotesque as well as portentous in writing the sentiments of a Tell, a Kosciusko, a Russell, an Emmet while practicing in a shooting gallery to make sure of his victim. If some dissolute Cavalier stabbed Cromwell he was getting rid of the tyrant of three kingdoms. One is not amazed at the deed of Charlotte Corday. The assassins of Roman Emperors slew enemies of the human race. When Scaevola went to the tent of Pyrrhus he meant to kill the genius and ambition which appeared fatal to his beloved Rome. One of the most mischievous consequences of the State education in India is to sow on a moral soil Western conceptions and traditions which the soil turns to poison. The wretched youth who killed Sir Curzon Wylie, from what one learns, is like the mass of the Indian students in London, the mass of the students in their own country, and all are the products of an education which assumed honor, obligation, duty, loyalty and gratitude in races or religions which, with one exception—even if one—did not possess the rudiments of these virtues. Why, the cultivation of the intellect as in the State schools of India, in keen, conscienceless, mendacious, subtle minds was the careful shaping of instruments to sap the "foreign" authority, as the imperial government is generally spoken of.

Of course, I am not opposed to State education—I should hope it is unnecessary for me to say this—but I deprecate a system divorced from religion and the morality it sanctions and which is conceived by philosophical statesmen destitute of experience and ignorant of the first principles of legislation.<sup>6</sup> One principle of legislation is that an account should be taken of those qualities in a people which constitute character. National character is a pretty constant force. One sees it surviving in great part the ordeal of historic trial despite the pressure of hostile influences. The State system in India took up in the different races supple intellects devoid of the elements which we seek for in a conception of social morality apart from primary domestic virtues; took up the 80,000,000 of Bengalis, the most intellectual people in India, and not merely in India, but in the world, at least as far as certain studies lead, and taught the methods of advancement in life and the implied morality that success justifies everything.

Life and property, the moral elements which hold society together are burned out in the incipient anarchism of the State schools.

---

<sup>6</sup> The Godless education in India has been condemned by Protestant Bishops in that country, who would prefer education coupled with the teachings of any form of religion to blind, rayless secularism.



Sentence had hardly been passed on the murderer of Sir Curzon Wylie when a prosecution is instituted at the Old Bailey against one Aldred for printing and publishing a seditious libel in the *Indian Sociologist* on the Government of India. This man, an Englishman doubtless, described himself as an Anarchist-Communist. The policy of the paper was to bring about the destruction of government in India by the murder of English men and women. I wonder where men can be found to regard incitements to assassination as political offenses merely? The editor of the paper was an Indian named Krishna Farma, who fled like a man after the publication, fled to France, as "the great and good" Emile Zola had fled to England after doing all the noble work by which he illustrated the honor and dignity, the political faithfulness and patriotism of La Grande Nation as now exhibited.

Now, whatever may be one's feelings with regard to patriotism, even though as a boy he may have debated on Harmodius and Aristogeiton and justified Sidney for pocketing the bribes of the great King, even though he may have been deeply interested as the son of a Tory, afterwards himself to be a squire and magistrate, a chairman of county boards and even of Quarter Sessions<sup>7</sup>—deeply interested, I say, in the pamphlet "Killing No Murder," directed against the life of the greatest Englishman of the seventeenth century—whatever may be one's feelings with regard to patriotism, he certainly must agree with the hundred and forty-six members of Parliament who wrote to Mr. Asquith to the effect that there should be no toleration of any "of the various forms of anarchical violence." This was written by certain Liberal, Laborer and the majority, I think, of the Irish members; but it seems to me that these gentlemen did not quite appreciate the situation. The deportation of the editors was followed by tranquillity.

I give the members in question the fullest credit for the wish to sustain the promoters of reform in India, but they may do—men of the kind always do—incalculable mischief through want of knowledge. Certain concessions, very small ones, might have postponed the War of Independence in America. The modes of thought in the mother country and the colonies were fundamentally alike. The people were one people separated by the ocean, and I venture to say the colonists were more attached to the King and the royal dignity than the people of England of any class whatever except ministers and placemen and the hangers-on of the court and the purlieus leading to pension or promotion.

<sup>7</sup> In Ireland, however, the chairman of Quarter Sessions is the county court judge. He presides over the unpaid density of his fellow-magistrates, and my friend the late Sir Francis Brady has even contributed to it.—V., "Irish Land Times."

The words quoted from the members of Parliament were written to the Prime Minister in a letter protesting against the deportation of the eight Bengali editors. There was nothing arbitrary in the proceeding, for it was provided in a law passed as far back as 1818, if I mistake not, under which gentlemen could be removed without trial from the scene of their mischievous writings or speeches.<sup>8</sup> Orators and leader writers who recommend assassination as a means to reform, or, even more, the forcing "the foreigner" from India, should count the cost of their utterances. The 146 Parliament men have kindly dissociated themselves from the arguments of the knife, the revolver, the poisoned fruit or the poisoned wine, the bomb-throwing and the train-wrecking, but surely they ought to have seen that the revolver of Madar Lal Dinghra and "the sweet reasonableness" of the editor of the *Indian Sociologist*, Mr. Krishna Varma, were startling comments on their interference with the action of the Indian executive and Lord Morley. The editor of this print holds up Dinghra as one of the immortals who gave their lives to the cause of liberty and reason. I can see him only a half-madman, eaten up with the desire for notoriety, or the instrument of a murder conspiracy upon whom the lot fell to "remove" a tyrant.

I am not disposed to condemn him so very much for his contempt of those loyal and sympathetic addresses poured out by the Indian residents in London. I was inclined to distrust them. Still, I must remember what took place during the agitation for the removal of Catholic disabilities, the overreadiness of Catholics to show their horror of crime and outrage when a few wretched peasants whose little crops were utterly destroyed and whose one small lamb or pig, whose goat or few hens were carried off by the tithe farmer or proctor—the ever-readiness, I say, to show horror because our poor ruined people now and then battered the proctor's head, the policemen's heads, the infantry and cavalry heads before being slain by carbine and musket at their own doors or amid their corn sheaves.

At any rate, what may be deplored in connection with this case of Dinghra's is that it has done more to call attention to what is obligingly described as "the condition of unrest" in India than hecatombs out there offered on the altar of English supremacy. The situation from the original conditions was difficult, but the difficulty has been increased to an extent almost insuperable by the irresponsible play of parties at home, the injudicious sympathy with the cause

---

<sup>8</sup> The revolutionary and "friend of man" government of France called the Consulate dealt in this way with editors faithful to the principles of 1789 as understood in 1793. What writer dared criticize proceedings of administration or Deputies from 1791 to 1799 in a reactionary sense? He would have been freed by the guillotine.

of justice on the part of the sincere Radicals, the monstrous readiness of the squire and the jingo to call for martial law untrammelled even with the pretense of trial. Jedwood justice, "Hang first and try afterwards," is the motto of the squires, the parsons, the lords and the Bishops whose hatred of reason, intolerance of right lost the American colonies and brought the empire to its knees in South Africa the other day. Now, in this age, when reform is the word, when the Turk speaks the language of constitutional liberty, when Persia imitates the Turk and Russia has her representative assembly, it would never do to stop reforms in India. The United Kingdom should sustain Lord Morley.

The reforms were in one sense instituted by the late Marquis of Ripon, but in reality they began long before his viceroyalty. What he did was to give a deeper meaning to national aspirations as he believed them to exist, to native interests as, of course, they really appeared to stand in the judgments of capable and fair-minded men. National aspirations were a foreign plant just like patriotism. The East knew nothing of these influences since Titus carried away the remnant from the ruined city of Jerusalem. In India, as in Persia and the great monarchies of old, there was the despot, the only man who could be called free, and a nation of slaves; there was no country in the sense of a parent passionately loved;<sup>9</sup> the idea was never dreamt of. Though the occupiers of the soil could defend it against an invader—for the *vae victis* was a perennial possibility—they submitted to defeat with equanimity. The conqueror was accepted, a task master hardly different from his predecessor, but this indifference to the most fateful events never applied to the origin and inroads of the East India Company, the aggressions of commercial clerks, the wars waged by counting-house chiefs on long descended princes, in whose blood the protection of their gods and the claims of their thousand cults were embodied. If a rajah bowed before the captain of a company of white men, he did so in that Eastern suppleness which would bend to the present exigency and wait with smiling face for the blessed hour of victory and revenge.

The Bengali pickle dealer parted with the tax levied on his with the bated breath and whispering humbleness of a good slave, all whose wealth and even life were at the service of the Sahib and the Emperor-King.<sup>10</sup> But it would not be well for the Sahib to go on foot to the pickle dealer's house unescorted or to dine with him with-

<sup>9</sup> The motherland is now a name from end to end of India. The idea has come from English teaching; the native schoolmasters, seditious and unscrupulous have adopted it as a catching cry.

<sup>10</sup> Not a Frenchman in the time of Napoleon I. was prouder of the term emperor-king than an educated Indian. In Oriental pride the word emperor appeals as an equivalent doubtless of the old form, "king of kings."



out witnesses. Yet this confidence was of late spreading, a circumstance hard to explain on any theory save the unreasoning confidence of these military men and civil servants from the United Kingdom, who think in India, as their countrymen do in Africa, that the white skin is an armor of proof. I understand that orders have been issued recently that officers of the army and officials in other services must be attended like Irish landlords or agents, boycotted tenants and herdsmen by armed men. These orders are looked upon as humiliating to the imperial race.

Lord Ripon's policy was to make the influence and usefulness of the natives a reality in the whole system of government, but it seems to me that his policy was misunderstood by those who in England took the cue from the officials, the military, the commercial men, the engineers and the clerks in India. Educate the natives for the work of self-government has been the policy all along. It was under this idea that a very high grade of education was set up, that the Civil Service examinations were open to Indian students, that they were encouraged to flood the inns of court and get called to the bar, that the prizes and prestige of Oxford and Cambridge were dangled before their eyes. Lord Ripon in proposing a larger proportion of natives for the administrative and legislative councils was affording the test for the value and safety of the system of education which is tersely expressed by Grattan as the policy of reforming governments—dealing with a subjugated people, "Greatly emancipate or fundamentally destroy!"

The cry of the oppressed officials went to England. Manor houses and castles, parsonages and sacristies, the parish school for the squire's tenants, maintained at the expense of the State; the athletic club, where the squire's tenants learned the doctrines of muscular Christianity from the young curate and the principles of high Toryism from the Lady Bountiful and her daughters, assisted by the ladies from the parsonage—all of these seats of political science thrilled and echoed to the enormity of allowing black men to govern white men.<sup>11</sup> Now the policy of the Marquis is that which Lord Morley is trying to get sanctioned in his scheme of reforms. He declares that he aims at conceding all administrative and legislative powers to the provincial councils, with the important constituent amendment that the nominated members shall henceforth be in a minority, but that a measure of national self-government is not to be dreamt of. The leader of the Opposition, Lord Lansdowne, gave his support to the measure on its introduction, but it is to be feared

---

<sup>11</sup> Among the many blazing indiscretions of his life Lord Salisbury described an Indian gentleman seeking election for an English constituency as "a black man" violating the traditions of Parliament and the country.

that the anarchism in India and its transplantation to England will stop the comprehensive enlightened, though tentative scheme of Lord Morley.

The Civil Service being open to the natives, one would at first sight suppose that a great number of the important appointments in that service would be filled by them. This, I believe, is not the case. This may be accounted for by the expense of going to England to attend the examinations, a burden on persons of limited means, and the Indian students in London are for the most part such persons. When one thinks that the British colleagues of those Indians in the Civil Service are gentlemen of high character and admirable antecedents, that their way of looking at matters of justice and administration is as far asunder from the Indian way as the North Pole is from the South, I am not at all sure that a change calculated to increase the number of Indian, and particularly Bengali candidates, will be an improvement on the existing provision. But the experiment is worth trying.

The character of land tenure was slightly outlined. The zamindars and the native collectors of the State rent, in those parts where the State is the landlord, are extortionate and heartless as Shylock where not restrained by the higher British officials. A large number of Indians in the districts now administered by our countrymen and kinsmen from the United Kingdom would be like locusts on the sadly visited regions. There would be the despair of a widely spread slavery and impoverishment; but the influence of the educated natives in the press, on the platform, as teachers in school and college would be employed to direct popular hatred to the imperial government instead of to the native collectors who violated justice as magistrates with an itching palm, who lifted the taxes with the insatiable cupidity of Turkish officials of the good old days. I judge the Emperor of India, if he had not a rebellion more dangerous than the great Mutiny of 1857 on his hands, would have territories emptied of inhabitants who had died of famine or had fled from it; would hear that the suburbs of his towns were swept by pestilence, the townspeople kept behind the walls lest they should contract the plague and were dying of famine in the streets, in the open sewers, at the foot of the ramparts which feebleness prevented them from climbing to precipitate themselves on the suburbs if his British subjects were replaced by natives.

The complaints made of British subordinate judges for the sentences they impose for petty larcenies, assaults and the like are listened to by high officials in the Viceroy's and the provincial Governors' courts, and cause head shaking among the squires of England, whose own sentences at Petty Sessions for poaching, sleeping

out, thefts of small things by children and first offenders are a sign and wonder to intelligent and humane men. Let it not be supposed that the squires think the sentences on black men who thief that they may eat excessive; no, but complaints to the India office may injuriously affect the interests of younger sons and relatives to whom India is still a land of good things. This is why they shake their heads.

It is said there is a good reason for the severe sentences. The Indian thief steals as a matter of course; the Indian generally lies unless it is more profitable to tell the truth, perjures himself in a court of justice with complacent facility, no matter what the judicial occasion may be. During the period of transition from the violence of entrance on land *vi et armis* to the time of peaceful conveyance by fine and recovery in England a successful method of appropriating estates took the place of the armed entry by numbers. A pre-contract, a secret conveyance and "competent false witnesses" did the business of robbery under the aegis of the statute of uses. Our ancestors were magnificent in their scoundrelism, but the perjury following the footsteps of a zamindar taking his tenants' conditional fee-simple, or his neighbor's estate guaranteed under a survey in pursuance of a land settlement investigation for assessment was a triumph of subtlety, treachery, cowardice, meanness, supported by a court full of instructed witnesses. The lands in such a case would, of course, be of small area, not like the wide lordships or baronies acquired by document and oath in Tudor England; but what SIX—Anarchism in India and Its Consequences.

the litigation lacked in the dignity of the subject matter it infinitely surpassed the old English iniquity in the multitude of the swearers, their ingenuity, plausibility, earnestness. When one remembers that it has been unsafe for the past few years for the Sahib to call at a friend's house unless he had as many attendants through the streets of Calcutta as a baron required going to the Tower to pay court to royalty in pre-Tudor days, that he could only safely dine with his Bengali fellow judge or collector by precautions similar to those that should be taken by the guest of a podesta in the sixteenth century on the eve of turning his magistracy into a principality, when one remembers the widespread falseness and the carefully nourished hatred of the natives, he can hardly blame our brothers of Ireland, our kinsmen of England and Scotland if they serve out a sharp dose of justice to the natives. I do not say that in the higher branches of the administrative and judicial services there are not to be found honorable men of the Indian races; of this the testimony is clear and convincing, but this is due, I submit, to an environment wholly un-Oriental from infancy. I can only think this when the



proof is irresistible that the educated natives, from the class called the Babu clerks up to great land holders and merchants, are poisoned to the finger-tips by a hatred of "foreign" rule.

To state the aspect of affairs in India as fairly as I can, I cannot wonder at the result just presented. One must regard the characteristics of the Orient; they are in the Asiatic, whatever may be his race, hardly differentiated except in the prominence of some with this, of more with the other quality. The Arab is as great a thief, for instance, as the Hindu; and this despite the manly virtues Mohamedanism is said to foster. I think it important to say that Oriental characteristics are fundamental elements of human nature as we find them in the savage, but subordinated to the intellectual control of interest as they are not in the savage. This is the case with all the races in India, but it is sufficient to consider the Presidencies and the Central Provinces, for each of these has a sort of autonomy favorable to examination; and, as I hold, in the chief characteristics the inhabitants are not very far apart from the men of the Northeast who roamed about naked, who committed murder with as little hesitation as a Scotch borderer in the sixteenth century, a red man on the warpath, a black man skulking round a Transvaal farmhouse.

The characteristics of the native, then, are hardly due to the scorpions with which the military clerks and afterwards the soldiers and officials of the East India Company scourged them, though I can allow that the vices begotten by servitude were intensified under European rule. I have already said that the prejudices of the imperial race are strong and carried out to India. There, hostile opinions and interests, possibly fears and resentments, are added to the imported prejudices. Such forces must produce an effect. They are reflected in the dark masses of the population, who, however, will not forfeit present advantages for words. They flashed out in the Mutiny, and the alarmists say they will flame out again from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, and not a white man will escape. The alarmists, though not inspired, predict that in spite of the benevolent platitudes of good-hearted Radicals in England, retired officials whose graciousness of mind is the outer sign of their congenital imbecility, but, above all, in spite of the loud hopes of the missionary, on whose good words hang the habits of Exeter Hall, the old ladies with their purses, the directors and promoters of wild-cat speculations whose promised checks are to appear in the reports of the proceedings, members of Parliament who combine a feeling for our black brothers with a desire to pose as public men—in spite of all and each of these hopeful classes the alarmists cry out India is lost; that if India is to be held "drastic measures" must be

resorted to and the reforms of "eccentric statesmen" must be arrested.<sup>12</sup> Let theirs be the fate of Cassandra, to be disbelieved. Panic is the source of their inspiration. Both the alarmist and the optimist are wrong. Great things have been done for India, and these in time must produce an era of peace and prosperity. There is such a form of loyalty as that of interest. The appeals of the irresponsible educated classes to the tillers of the soil are unsuccessful, though listened to with placidity. This class knows that their predecessors never enjoyed the security they possess for profitable labor. There is, indeed, no enthusiasm in their attachment to the empire, but theirs is the tranquil bearing of men who hope for improved conditions as they stand, and who dread that a transfer of dominion to native princes or to strangers would reduce them to hopeless servitude. They are aware that taxation under the native princes who hold semi-independent States under the protection of the Crown is higher than what they are required to bear. In one instance at least this has been proved when there was an offer of exchange of lands between the imperial government and a native prince. The ryots proposed to pay increased taxes rather than consent to the exchange. Now, the ryots constitute the population, for the educated classes to which reference has been already made so often, are only one per cent. of the Indian people. They are a disastrous product of a vicious system of education; they are the criminal associations whose methods are those of European Anarchists, whose activity can be checked at any moment by the offer of places, however subordinate and salaries however trifling under the imperial government. To deal with factitious and interested discontent, with the native army loyal and the native feudatories<sup>13</sup> attached to the greatness of the empire cannot be beyond the resources of statesmanship.

GEORGE McDERMOT, C. S. P.

New York, N. Y.

---

<sup>12</sup> Lord Ripon has been so described recently. I am sure Lord Morley, a notorious Radical, would get credit for any kind of treason.

<sup>13</sup> It is possible that the attachment of these princes to their Suzerain, the Emperor-King, may be less binding than is thought. Residents should not be permitted to play the part of spies as well as ambassadors. All the natives felt keenly the trial of the Guikwar of Baroda on a charge by a resident of attempting to poison him.

## THE SITUATION IN SPAIN.

THESE are, perhaps, few lands more difficult to handle in public print than Spain. This revolution-ridden country presents to us a kaleidoscopic picture of intrigues, varying politics, constitutions and conspiracies, civil wars and assassinations that are simply bewildering. Yet whosoever should judge Spain by what appears upon the surface would be far wide of the mark. Still more would he err who would permit himself to be guided by the current reports circulating through the British, Continental or American press. Spain has had in the past more than in the present bitter political and religious enemies, and even to-day that feeling of hostility has not completely subsided. Every now and then news comes to us from the Peninsula which often proves to be false, or at most fiction founded on fact. What assertions were not made, what groundless reports circulated some years ago concerning the domestic affairs of the Madrid palace which fell to the ground of their own weight! A few years since a very sensational story appeared in a highly respectable paper of Baltimore, taken from a well-known and much read New York journal. It concerned a certain Moorish woman named Fatima, who it was said had escaped from the harem of the Sultan of Morocco, and whom Spain, in spite of many protests, was, through the workings of diplomacy, to deliver up to the tender mercies of the Sultan. The facts were ascertained, and the true story of Fatima, who had nothing at all to do with the Sultan's harem, was sent to the Baltimore paper in question, but it probably found its way to the wastepaper basket. At least I am not aware that anything ever came of it.

The causes of present conditions in Spain must be sought for as far back as the period of the French Revolution, when the equilibrium of the whole world was disturbed. At that time Spain, as own, was politically a united kingdom, but to understand the Spaniards it is necessary to remember that that kingdom was the outcome of a number of originally independent States, each with its own characteristics that have been, to a large extent, retained down to the present time. What may be said of the people of one province, Estremadura, for instance, can by no means be predicated of that of other provinces, taken singly or collectively. For the Spaniard, his native province, Castile, Andalusia or whatever it may be, is first and foremost his country, with its manners and customs, its traditions and its dialect.

Jeromino Becker, writing in *Nuestro Tiempo*, sees precisely in this lack of unity one of the greatest reasons for the decline of Spain's



power. The union of States did not produce unity, and the provinces continued to hold on to their several interests. I am not prepared to endorse this view entirely, although there can be no doubt that the ethnological differences that have existed and that still exist had much to do with the revolutions and civil wars which on various occasions have swept over the Peninsula. There was at one time a party that strove to add to these divergences by advocating a Federal Republic, a measure which probably would have hastened the disintegration of the nation by leaving complete autonomy to each separate province.

Under the Roman, and later under the Visigoths, Spain was united for period of nearly a thousand years, since the Punic wars, which had put an end to Cathaginian sway. During this long period the foundations were laid for the Spanish people, the outcome of Celtiberians, Greeks, Carthaginians, Romans and Visigoths, and for the Spanish dialects, daughters of the Latin. In the eighth century another element was introduced into the Peninsula, that of the Moors, who overran it, and, finally, kept the southern portion until successive wars drove them away forever.

Shortly after the battle of Guadalete, when Don Rodrigo fell, in 711, the reconstruction of the monarchy began with a number of independent States that gradually grew closer together until they coalesced. The kingdoms of Oviedo, the Asturias and Leon, uniting with the County of Castile, became the monarchy of that name. At the base of the Pyrenees arose Navarra, to the south Aragon, while the County of Catalonia stretched along the Mediterranean shores. Gradually Castile and Aragon encroached upon the country of the Moors until their crowns were united by the marriage of Ferdinand and Isabella and Granada fell. Charles V., the Emperor, who was Charles I. of Spain, beheld himself by the annexation of Navarra monarch of all the Spains and of a united kingdom which he bequeathed to his successors.

In the eighteenth century the House of Austria was followed by the House of Bourbon, though it took a bloody war to effect the succession.

The mediæval Spanish States were carried on upon democratic principles, and no people in Europe, perhaps, loved freedom so much and enjoyed such a degree of it as the inhabitants of the Iberian Peninsula. By the sixteenth century the old feudal system passed away throughout Europe and absolutism of monarchy prevailed. This was especially true in Spain, where from Charles V. to Ferdinand VII. the sovereign's rule became supreme. The spirit of liberty was, if not annihilated, at least held under such control that, with the exception of the Basque provinces, it dared not assert itself.

The Inquisition, with its countless ramifications, was a most powerful adjunct to this absolutist power of Church and State, though it certainly kept Spain free with an iron hand from the heresies that swept over Northern Europe. The Bourbons and the Stuarts remained almost to our own time the last representatives of absolutism in Western Europe.

The French Revolution, with all its horrors, was a tremendous upheaval of the old established order of things, and the world has not yet quite recovered from its effects. It spread the terror of its arms over a portion of Europe, while its ideas flew like wildfire over the world. Spain was one of the first to catch the contagion. Ever since the advent of the House of Bourbon French literature had invaded Spain and the Spanish American colonies, and the works of the encyclopædists became quite familiar to educated readers. Thus the principles of 1789 found an entrance into Spain, but Spaniards were not prepared to break with monarchy or adopt a republic. Their attachment to their Kings was paramount, and it may be said to pervade the masses still. The constitution of 1812, drawn up at Cadiz, when Ferdinand VII. was an exile and Napoleon was foisting his brother, Joseph, on the Spanish people, was not a republican constitution. No matter how much it was impregnated with French ideas, it had monarchy for its basis. Yet, though short lived, it inaugurated a new era and furnished the keynote for that struggle between conservatism and liberalism which went on all through the nineteenth century, and which still continues.

Neither was the constitution of Cadiz tainted by the hatred of religion which marked the French Revolution. Though the Inquisition had fallen and only the extreme reactionists wanted it back, the masses were strongly attached to the ancient faith, and under the constitution the Catholic religion remained the religion of the State. The day had not yet come, but it was coming, when men would cry, "Viva la Republica," and war would be waged against the Church.

The early struggle was between absolutists and constitutionalists. Under the restoration, when the troops of the Duke d'Angouleme, acting for the Holy Alliance, had strengthened the throne of Ferdinand, the former triumphed and the latter conspired. The work of the secret societies increased.

When Ferdinand died, after abrogating the Salic law, constitutionalism gained the upper hand under the regency of the first Cristina, Ferdinand's widow, but a bloody civil war was the result. The Church ranged itself on the side of conservatism, and when the word meant absolutism she took that side. Hence it is that in both civil wars we find so many of the clergy on the side of the Carlists.

The clergy were feared by the liberals, who dreaded their influence on the throne and on the people, while the clergy looked askance at liberalism, which more than once meant suppression of the religious orders and the confiscation of ecclesiastical property. Unfortunately for the Church and for the people, the best example did not emanate from the palace, and there is no doubt that scandals in high places culminated in the downfall of the dynasty in 1869.

In the meantime political opinions had assumed the most variegated shades, and at one time there were about thirty different parties in Spain. Republican tendencies had been gaining ground, and socialism had crossed the Pyrenees. However, the country was not ripe for a republic. It was tried after the short reign of Amadeo, but as Castelar, who had himself been President, said, it was impossible to have a republic without republicans. The masses were monarchical, and in the north, where the troops of Don Carlos were operating, the people were strongly for legitimacy, which, though its Princes professed their willingness to accept constitutional government, in the beginning at least represented absolutism.

With Alfonso XII. peace returned to distracted Spain. The Carlists were driven over the border and the malcontents contented themselves with speaking and writing or ventilating their grievances in Cortes. During his reign and during the minority of Alfonso XIII., under the regency of the universally respected Maria Cristina, Antonio Canovas del Castillo was the leading spirit in Spanish politics. He had put Alfonso XII. on the throne, and his influence continued until he fell a victim to the machinations of Anarchists.

I well remember Don Antonio and his commanding presence, as well as his oratorical powers. Little did I dream when I heard him speak at the opening of the International Congress of Americanists at La Rabida, in 1892, that before many years his life would end so tragically. About the same time I stood not far from the boy King on the balcony of the Palacia de la Deputacion Provincial, in Huelva, and once as my glance met his I could not help wondering what the future of this boy would be. He has had a troubled reign. First, there were difficulties with the Moors at Ceuta. Ever since the sixteenth century Spain has held a number of ports on the coast of Morocco, and it is one of these that is responsible for the recent outbreaks. Hardly had this trouble passed than the Cuban war broke out, and poor Spain was drained of its men and money. Still she willingly made the sacrifice, for Spanish pride could not brook the idea of parting with Cuba. But her colonial system was doomed, and the Spanish-American War deprived her of her colonies. With this incubus removed, there was hope for her. When I had the



pleasure of conversing with the late Admiral Cervera at Annapolis, shortly after the destruction of his fleet, I remarked to him that I thought the loss of the colonies would enable Spain to concentrate her energies and develop her own resources. What the courteous old gentleman thought I could not know; he merely shrugged his shoulders. Had he perhaps in mind the numerous political differences that would continue to distract the unfortunate country? The fact is that since the loss of the colonies Spain has been advancing on the road to prosperity. Luis Garcia Ginjaro, professor of the University of Madrid, writes<sup>1</sup> that "the liberation of Cuba and the Philippines was the beginning of Spain's regeneration." There is no doubt that with the loss of the colonies a great weight was raised from her shoulders and a tremendous drain on her resources ceased. At present a taste for agriculture is developing; modern agricultural machinery is replacing the obsolete instruments used until a late day, and there are general signs of awakening industry throughout the country.

Political parties still exist. At present there are four especially prominent—namely, the Conservatives, Liberals, Republicans and Carlists. The government is now Conservative, with Señor Maura at the head. As a rule the laboring classes in the great centres of industry are of Republican or Socialist tendencies, while, on the other hand, the peasantry is strongly Conservative, though susceptible to influences.

In the liberal ranks no little hostility to the Church still exists. An echo of this may be found in an article, written for the *International* by the late Nicolas Salmeron, at one time President of the Spanish Republic, and completed after his death by his son, in which he places the blame for the decline of Spain, as he views it, on the influence of the Church and on the defective system of education that generally prevails.<sup>2</sup>

Señor Ginjarro writes: "For the people to be Republican means to be hostile 'à outrance' to the government, to the Church and to property rights. Naturally those who hold these opinions have had to separate little by little from those who believe in law and order, whence came the division of the party into 'governmentals' and 'radicals.'"<sup>3</sup>

The young King has also had his trouble with the Anarchists, and the dastardly attempt on his life and that of his bride is still fresh in memory. The present signs of revolution in Spain are different from all others. Other rebellions, riots or revolutions were

---

<sup>1</sup> "Spain Since 1898," *Yale Review*, May, 1909.

<sup>2</sup> *International*, London, August, 1909.

<sup>3</sup> *Review of Reviews*, September, 1909.

directed against a political party in the nation or against real or supposed abuses on the part of its rulers. The present agitation is rather international than national. It is directed against the basis of society and against society itself. It is a manifestation of that universal spirit of socialism and anarchy that pervades the world from autocratic Russia to democratic America. And yet there are few countries where agitators on the socialist stage have, at least from an economic standpoint, less reason to agitate than Spain. There social legislation in favor of the poorer classes has reached a high stage. Its law on professional risks and accidents to laborers has been in operation since 1900. Laws, too, exist to regulate the labor of women and children, the observance of Sunday, tribunals of industry and the right of association. All this was brought about, not by the agitation of the so-called proletariat, but by the mental labor of the middle classes and of those who for the last thirty years have devoted themselves to the study of economic conditions, not in theory only, but with practical results. The aristocratic class instead of opposing these measures of reform, have endeavored to promote them. The unfortunate movements at Barcelona may be a drawback to these efforts, for there are those that point a warning finger at the danger of a reaction. Such a reaction would be nothing new in Spain, where principles are rigorously carried to their conclusion, and where retaliatory measures are apt to be extreme. The events of July may also greatly retard any movement in favor of autonomy in Catalonia.

The present trouble began with a conflict in Morocco. Since the early part of the fifteenth century, years before the fall of Granada, Ceuta, on the African coast, has belonged to the Christians. It was conquered by King John I. of Portugal. With the union of Portugal to Spain, in the reign of Philip II., it passed over to the latter country, and it is to-day, with other Moorish territory, still in the hands of the Spaniards, although it has been several times besieged by the Moors. For a long time before Cuba was lost to Spain its name was a terror to political offenders, for Ceuta is a penal colony.

In 1859, while Isabella reigned, Spain got into trouble with Morocco and declared war because that country refused to cede territory which Spain claimed for the protection of its settlements on the coast. The Moors were defeated at Castillejo by General Prim, and a month later Tetuan surrendered, giving to O'Donnell his title of Duke. Peace was signed shortly after, when Morocco agreed to pay 20,000,000 piastres. O'Donnell had earned his title, unlike others of the period, when titles of nobility were so lavishly bestowed upon favorites.

The strip of land along the coast of Morocco where lies the zone

of Spanish influence is known as the Riff, which means cultivated land, though to judge by the character of the ground the name is a misnomer. This influence of Spain has been acknowledged by France and England, and it was recently confirmed by the Algeciras conference, which left the policing of the region to Spain, although France has continued to wield predominant power in Morocco.

General Marina a few weeks ago, addressing his troops, said: "Europe has entrusted us with a glorious mission to prepare the way for the civilization of this savage country. We know how to accomplish it."

The tribes inhabiting this district are of a most primitive character and practically independent of the Sultan of Morocco. War between tribes and the *vendetta* are common among them. They are well provided with firearms of various patterns, and as a general rule they are excellent marksmen.

The Spanish settlements are Piñon de Velez, Alhucemas and Zafarinas, on islands, and Ceuta and Melilla, on the mainland. This last remnant of her great colonization system has, perhaps, cost Spain more blood and treasure than any other of her colonies. These "presidios," as they are called, were for a long time absolutely worthless except as penal colonies, the purpose for which they are employed. It is doubtful as to whether the prisoners suffer more than the unfortunate soldiers who drag out many a weary day in watching them. It ought to be a relief for Spain to get rid of this nuisance. Yet Spanish pride would probably revolt at the idea, as it revolted at the thought of losing Cuba.

Last year the tribes of the Riff were under the authority of Roghi, the pretender to the throne of Morocco. From him the Spaniards obtained permission to open up some mines about fifteen miles from Melilla and to build a railway which was to be known as the Spanish North African Railroad. Last October the tribes revolted and raided the mines, which ceased work until June.

The new Sultan, Muley Hafid, who had succeeded his dethroned predecessor, the one who had signed the act of Algeciras, was hostile to this agreement and to European influences. He was naturally averse to ratifying concessions made by the Roghi, whom he regarded as a rebel against his authority.

Spain began to prepare for hostilities and despatched troops to the troubled territory. Under the cover of their guns the miners resumed operations. Amicable means were also resorted to, and Don Alfonso Merry del Val, the Spanish representative in Morocco, was sent to conduct negotiations with the Sultan, but without practical result, as the decision was postponed until a Moorish embassy should be sent to Madrid.



On July 9 Sid-Ahmed-Ben-el-Muar, Ambassador of Muley Hafid, Sultan of Morocco, reached Madrid with his suite. The Moors were clad in their national, Bedouin-like costume, the same they, no doubt, wore when, in the eighth century, they first invaded Spain. They were received with true Spanish dignity at the southern station, and the Madrilenos opened their eyes in wonder at the unaccustomed spectacle, familiar enough at Gibraltar.

The Moors had hardly taken up their quarters at the Hotel Russia, not far from the Puerta del Sol, than the startling news arrived of an attack on the workmen who were building the railroad to mine Francesa, near Mafra.

As the Spaniards had refused to cease operations, obnoxious to a party of the tribesmen, the attack was suddenly made. Four laborers—Emilio Esteban, Tomas Almeida, Cristobal Sanchez and Salvador Perez—were killed and one man was severely wounded. General Marina, who commanded the Spanish troops, at once started to the front with two companies of the regiment of Africa, some artillery and other forces. The enemy's position was taken and the bodies of the laborers recovered. The Moorish loss was supposed to be about one hundred and fifty in killed and wounded, but the Spaniards paid dearly for their victory, having lost one officer and five men killed, besides a captain, two officers and twenty men wounded.

On July 23 a fight occurred between the Spaniards and the Moors, with disastrous results to the former, who lost a colonel and six officers, besides a lieutenant colonel left in the hands of the enemy. A major, four captains, seven lieutenants and two hundred and sixty non-commissioned officers and privates were wounded. The Spaniards had proceeded directly from the steamer to the battlefield.

Another fight occurred on July 26, in which the Spaniards fought with their accustomed bravery. Yet their losses were serious, though it is supposed that the enemy suffered more. A number of officers fell, prominent among whom were General Pintos and Colonels Arapiles and Las Navas. A young officer named Angel Salecedo was killed while leading his men mid a shower of bullets, exclaiming: "Come on, boys; this is nothing."

The Spaniards had then 20,000 men in and near Melilla. By this time the reserves had been called out. Realizing the fact that a large number of these men had families dependent upon them, their countrymen hastened to their support with pecuniary assistance, individuals and societies contributing to the families of the reserves. The whole royal family were on the list of subscribers, and on July 25 the *Epoca*, of Madrid, opened a subscription list, headed by the

Marquis de Puesto Segnro with 25,000 pesetas, or nominally about \$5,000.

As a general rule the Republicans were opposed to the war. As to its popularity among the people at large there appears to be some difference of opinion. Conservative authorities insist that the people were with the government, while, on the other hand, we are told that when the first troops were ordered to Melilla the nation was aroused by an anti-war outcry, which, began by the women and children, was taken up by the working classes and culminated in a mutiny among the soldiers.

On the one hand, we are told that the Reservists resented being sent out of Spain, and, on the other, we hear that they responded with great alacrity and that even the mothers of the boys urged them on to do their duty. It will probably take some time before we reach the exact truth in the matter.

The news from the front created great excitement, and the Socialist and Anarchist elements in Barcelona were not slow to make use of their opportunity. Catalonia has often been a nucleus of revolutionary movements, with aspirations for liberty or at least autonomy.

Barcelona, the commercial centre of Spain, has become also the centre of socialistic agitation, not only for Spain, but for the world, although it is not unlikely that the heads and leaders of the movement are Frenchmen and other foreigners who have settled there. For a long time Barcelona had been feared by the law-abiding elements, and in the early part of July four bombs were found; one in the theatre, the Teatro Principal, though being charged only with powder, they were probably intended more as a menace than anything else.

A tourist in the Peninsula, who has formed his ideas of the country by what he has seen in the Castiles, in Andalusia or in Aragon, is surprised on reaching Barcelona to see how un-Spanish everything seems. Certainly there is much that is old; there is the Cathedral, for instance, and there are other remnants of mediæval Spain, but, on the whole, Barcelona, the chief city of Catalonia, is a beautiful, modern, up-to-date town, teeming with life and activity. Here one observes little of the easy-going manners noticeable elsewhere. Here all is quick, alert, businesslike, for Barcelona is the city of industry, the city of manufacturing and commerce. An industrial depression is bound to affect Barcelona more than any other Spanish city, and, like other monetary centres, nothing will disturb it more than an appeal to its pocket.

Even the popular dialect of Catalonia is different from that of the rest of the country. The Catalan is a form of the Limousin, or

Provençal, a dialect once so widespread, the earliest literary language of the Romance family, the one in which the troubadour wrote and sang. Politically Catalonia has been noted for its restless spirit. One of the worst riots of its history occurred on July 25, 1835, when in one night the convents of Calced and Discalced Carmelites, of the Dominicans, Trinitarians, Augustinians and Minims were burned to the ground. Plunder reigned supreme. Churches were desecrated and sacked, archives and libraries scattered to the winds and religious massacred. There was greater loss of life than in the disturbances of this year, though perhaps the loss of property is now of vaster proportions.

Trouble began to manifest itself on the present occasion as early as July 25, when *El Progreso*<sup>4</sup> published an article, in which the burning of the convents was hinted at. It appears quite evident that the riots of the following days were the results of a preconcerted plan, and the events in Barcelona show us what to expect if Anarchists ever get the upper hand. We may witness another Reign of Terror, and the French Revolution may be repeated.

There seems to have been much exaggeration in the foreign press, but enough remains to show that the matter was very serious. The calling out of the reserves furnished a pretext. The organizers of the revolt spent their money lavishly, and an appeal was made to the workingmen. The latter, imagining that there was only a question of protesting against the war, gave their support to the movement. When the laborers who were in good faith discovered the real animus of the agitation they tried to withdraw, but it was too late. However, they made the condition that no factories should be burned, and in effect none of these was destroyed. The mob succeeded in obtaining possession of nearly all the petroleum and other inflammable substances in Barcelona, and the price of the former article suddenly rose very high. The doors of churches and convents were smeared with the oil and the dastardly work of destruction began. Although scarcely more than six victims lost their life, the havoc to property was immense. A number of churches were totally destroyed, and the following convents and monasteries were either completely or partially ruined: First we note a chapel of the Franciscans, the house of the Marist Fathers, the Convent of San Sebastian, those of the nuns in the street of St. Eulalia and another in the street of Mallorca, the convent of the Escolapian nuns and that of the Carmelites, the convent of San Carlin de Grinnardo, that of the French Marists, of Casanova and an educational institution directed by priests. In another district we find totally destroyed a convent and orphanage, the convent of the Sacred Heart and that

---

<sup>4</sup> See "La Epoca," cited by La Lectura Dominical of Madrid, August 7.



of the Discalced Carmelites. The house of the Marist Brothers and one of the Sisters of Charity were also burned, besides those of the Immaculata, of the Sisters of the Servite Order, of the Paulas, la Madalena, la Punxa, of the Missions of the Sacred Heart and of the Penitents. Other sufferers to a greater or lesser extent were the convents of Mount Sion, of Bernardine nuns, of the Child Jesus, of Carmelites again. The magnificent college of the Escolapios was burned and the prior of the monastery of San Magin was among the killed. We are particularly horrified by what occurred at the convent of the Jeronymite nuns. On July 28 several groups of the rioters proceeded to the convent, where the nuns, having learned of their danger, were spending the time praying in their church. The building was besieged and the nuns were subjected to ill treatment. Not content with this, the wretches dug up the corpses of the Sisters who had died last and carried them in a ghastly procession through the streets, leaving them at various places in the city, such as the doors of churches and at the houses of citizens. It is said that the authorities gathered fourteen of these corpses.

Another sad feature of the occasion was the sight of about five or six thousand children, driven from the asylums, wandering about the streets, imploring charity. It must be added, to the great credit of the citizens of Barcelona, that in spite of the risk they were running, they gathered up the unfortunate little ones, and dividing them among various houses, undertook to care for them.

The wretches, to whom the city was for a while delivered over, spared nothing. The magnificent library of the Pious Schools, of 80,000 volumes of great value, as well as their costly museum of natural sciences, was consumed by the flames, ignited by these products of modern theories.

We are ashamed to relate that in this city of New York men were found of similar opinions to sympathize with the so-called anti-war demonstrations of Barcelona.

Thus far I have not mentioned the Jesuits. Let us see what happened to them. It would, indeed, have been passing strange had they been left unmolested. About seven o'clock on the evening of July 28 the mob stood before their residence in the Caspe street. But the Fathers were prepared for them. A detachment of the Civil Guard, the famous *Guardia Civil* of Spain, was stationed in the convent, and the mob was held at bay, although the proposal was made among them to blow up the building with dynamite. The rioters kept up demonstrations until ten o'clock, when they dispersed. Thus the Jesuit house escaped the fate of so many other institutions.

This unfortunate state of affairs, says the *Lectura Dominical*, was

undoubtedly brought about by the frequent utterances and the propaganda of an irreligious press, which, finally alarmed at the consequences resulting from its own premises, raised a hypocritical cry of distress.

It is almost incredible that Barcelona should thus have been delivered over to mob violence before the insurrection could be repressed. The authorities were taken by surprise and the city was undefended. At all events, they were unable to cope with the evil in the beginning. It has been said that at first the soldiers fired over the heads of the mob. Whether this be true or not of one or the other detachments, I am assured that the Spanish army as a whole is perfectly loyal and that the nation is in sympathy with the war.

Among those who gone to the front figures the name of the Duke de Medina de Rioseco, of one of the most ancient families of Spain.

His wife accompanied him in the steamer to assist the wounded at Melilla. The whole batallion to which the Duke belongs was roused to a high pitch of enthusiasm by this example. A project was also found by a number of young men to organize a body of mounted troopers at their own expense, modeled after our own Rough Riders. It is thus quite evident that the cavalier spirit of the fifteenth century is not yet extinct in Spain.

From all this we may infer that the opposition to the war was the work of a faction, incited by a number of demagogues. At all events, after the first shock of surprise the government became master of the situation. Don Luis de Santiago, captain general of the district, set the troops in motion as soon as he could, and when reinforcements arrived fierce fighting began. The revolution, if it may be styled thus, was completely crushed in Barcelona and at other places in Catalonia where it had made its appearance. Measures were also taken to prevent an outbreak elsewhere, for from July 28 until peace was restored constitutional guarantees were suspended and martial law was proclaimed.

The disorders in Barcelona, contrary to what the agitators may have expected, have contributed to rally the country to the support of the government and strengthen its hand.

Spain has also the good fortune to be ruled by a strong hand, for Señor Maura is a powerful statesman and probably the leading Spaniard to-day. He is a Conservative and a good Catholic.

Two conspicuous figures have this year passed from the Spanish stage. Admiral Cervera died on April 3, the day after the Cabinet had decided to reconstruct the navy. It is safe to say that no more admirable figure appears in the history of the Spanish-American War. His correspondence, published shortly after his defeat, shows

him to have been the victim of mismanagement and blundering, if not worse. Knowing that he was doomed, yet obeying orders, he made his famous dash for liberty in broad daylight, and carried his fleet to destruction. Though defeated, he commands our respect and our admiration, and I am sure that American historians will always mention him with sympathy.

The other distinguished personage whose death has been recorded is Don Carlos de Bourbon, Duke of Madrid, known also as Charles VII., or the pretender. With him closes a romantic yet sad chapter of Spanish history. His son, Don Jaime, has succeeded to his rights. It has been supposed that he has been watching his chance in the present troubled state of the country, and that another Carlist uprising is among the possibilities. The Carlist party, though it has a comparatively small representation in Cortes, is still a force. Carlists, unlike the Republicans, are generally recruited from the peasantry; but it is precisely in the peasantry, uncontaminated by foreign influences, that the bone and sinew of the nation are to be found. It is possible that the party will change its name and become "Jaimistas," as many of the Carlists have thus been styled for some time. Although the government contends that Carlism need no longer be reckoned with, the party still lives, and it seems to be in a better condition than any other party. It has more than forty newspapers throughout Spain, and clubs in almost all cities, even where Republicans are in the majority. It is not so clerical as in 1873, but the lower orders of the clergy still support it. The death of Don Carlos and the succession of Don Jaime may mean a rejuvenation of the party.

The war in Morocco between the tribesmen and the Spaniards still continues, but it is difficult to obtain reliable information owing to the strict censorship of the press which is enforced. There are those in Spain among the conservative elements who would gladly behold a continued censorship of the press, as they believe, and not without foundation, that the organs hostile to Church and State are the greatest cause of the spread of dangerous Socialist and Anarchist principles among the masses. On the other hand, the Liberals as such have always contended for the freedom of the press in Spain as well as elsewhere.

What the outcome of all this will be it is hard at the present moment to prognosticate. We know that it is in the nature of the Spanish character to fight to the bitter end. As long as there is a foreign enemy to be encountered the better elements of the nation will remain united. The King himself set an example of patriotism by his desire to go in person to Melilla, thus imitating his royal father, who personally advanced against the Carlists. However,



he has yielded to the wishes of his subjects in remaining at home, where probably his presence is more needed than at Melilla.

It is unfortunate that these troubles should have come at the present moment to retard Spain on her way to prosperity. All of us who remember the great benefits she conferred in the past on civilization by her achievements in literature, in the arts and in the exploration of unknown countries, as well as the laborious and patient labors in the historical field in our own day, will surely express the wish that this cloud which now obscures the brightness of her sky may soon pass.

CHARLES WARREN CURRIER.

Washington, D. C.

---

## "THE CHRIST OF HISTORY AND THE CHRIST OF FAITH."

Le Christ de l'histoire et le Christ de la foi: Le Programme Des Modernistes.

WE ARE living in an age of warped mentality. Right reasoning seems to be a lost art. Sane habits of thinking seem to have gone completely out of fashion. False principles, false reasoning from true principles and consequently false conclusions confront us everywhere. They have been the rule for over half a century. Perhaps the most striking instance of this is Herbert Spencer's once famous principle of the "survival of the fittest." It was once the great shibboleth of the evolutionist. From evolution it passed into every branch of knowledge. It not only completely superseded its great Darwinian synonym, "natural selection," in their own special field of science, but it was at once extended to every department of science, to history, to literature, to politics, to economics, to sociologies, to religion—everywhere. The principle was echoed and re-echoed on the platform, from the pulpit, at the bar, on the bench, in the press. No argument was complete without it. It was the *piece de resistance* of every debate. It was the climax in every bit of forceful oratory and soaring eloquence. It was the crowning glory in every hypothesis and new-sprung theory. It was the recognized principle which held paramount sway throughout every realm of nature, whether organic or inorganic; throughout all institutions, whether moral or social; throughout all organizations, whether physical, political or religious. It extended even to the living cells of which the living organism is composed.

At last, through sheer force of criticism, Spencer was forced to

admit that no such principle exists or ever existed; that the expression itself contained a glaring fallacy; that it was a mere sophism, a vicious circle, which, like the dog pursuing his own tail, began nowhere and led nowhither; that it audaciously assumed the very thing which it was supposed to demonstrate, declaring, on the one hand, that the reason why a thing survived was because it was the fittest, and on the other, that the proof that it was the fittest was the fact that it survived. It should not have taken a whole generation to detect the patent fallacy in the boasted principle; yet the fact is that even when Spencer was driven to confess its absurdity and repudiate the phrase, the world was loath to part with an expression which it had taken to its bosom so fondly and cherished so tenderly; and so reluctant was the abandonment of it that even now, more than twenty years after its repudiation by its creator, there may occasionally be found a literary or logical backwoodsman who still clings to it with pertinacious tenacity.

The reasons for this warped mentality are not far to seek. During the past half century men's minds have been drawn to the study of the physical sciences almost to the utter exclusion of other subjects. Philosophy—"divine philosophy," as Milton styled it—has been practically ignored. Logic and metaphysic have suffered more perhaps than any other department of learning; and the consequence is that it is difficult to find a modern work which purports to give us accurate reasoning on any subject, which is not thicksown, as the night with stars, with every species of glittering fallacy.

With this reason another—a kindred one—is closely linked. It is the extraordinary impulse given to hypothesizing in every direction by the speculations of Darwin. Speculation, theory, hypothesis, became the order of the day. In the various departments of science, in the vexed problems of history, in the perplexing mysteries of religion speculation became supreme, and in the breakneck speed with which men strove to arrive at their predetermined conclusions sanity of thought was abandoned and logic flung to the winds.

The most noteworthy and the most deplorable instance of this in our day is to be found in what is now known as "modernism;" and among the modernists the most remarkable instance of baseless hypothesis and its concomitant recklessness of thought is the theory which, in spite of the admonition of St. Paul, would divide the Saviour of mankind and give us "The Christ of History and the Christ of Faith."

The modernistic creed may be found in a strange volume compiled or written in reply to the Papal encyclical, "*Pascendi Dominici Gregis*," originally published in Italian, a copy of the French translation of which, "*Le Programme Des Modernistes*," lies before

us. It may be said in passing that if "*la critique*" be the art of obtaining correct knowledge, "*la logique*" is the art of correct thought, and that the former should be always accompanied by the latter—if we are to arrive at true conclusions. In other words, correct knowledge depends upon correct thinking and cannot be had without it. In the volume before us it is amazing to find how far men may wander from correct principles of thought and by what tortuous ways they toil and travel to false conclusions, apparently without the slightest suspicion of their knight-errancy or the absurd consequences of their aberrations. This seems to be the leading characteristic of the entire school of modern Biblical criticism. "*Back to logic*" should be the slogan to recall them to reason. At present in their mad wanderings the whole wildly roaming herd ruthlessly tramples down everything sacred and profane, while the sacred principles of Christianity and the safe and sound principles of logic suffer most severely from their lawless depredations.

In this article we shall confine ourselves to that portion of "*Le Programme Des Modernistes*" which treats of "*The Christ of History and the Christ of Faith.*"

It should be stated at the outset that it is not always easy to get a clear view of the modernist's opinions. Indeed, it is very doubtful whether the modernist himself has a very clear conception of his own views upon any particular point. Logic is not the only thing lacking in the volume before us. There is confusion of thought and contradiction of statement throughout. It not unfrequently happens that, apparently alarmed at his own statement, the modernist again and again returns upon it, modifies, cancels and contradicts it. There is an unstable element in all his opinions whether he puts them forward with hesitation and timidity, whether he delivers them pleadingly and beseechingly or whether he sounds the note of defiance, assurance and arrogance. This inconsistency with himself renders the task of refutation rather difficult; for the modernist of one page is never the modernist of the next.

This is especially true of his theory of a divided Christ where we find statements as broad as anything in Renan or Strauss, and again when we find orthodoxy and fervor which might have been dictated by St. Bernard. If there really be the distinction between the Christ of history and the Christ of faith which the modernist would persuade us there is, there should be no difficulty in drawing distinctly the line of demarcation between the two. Nothing should be easier than to take the facts of the Gospel history and align them in accordance with the new distinction. Prescinding wholly from the Christ of prophecy—which does not seem to come within the purview of the modernist in this distinction—and prescinding also of the Christ



of mystic theology, which, too, seems to come but remotely—if at all—within his scope, there is left to us the Christ of the New Testament. For the sake of simplifying the problem, we may even eliminate the allusions in the epistles and the Acts of the Apostles, and confine the problem to the facts which the Gospels relate of Christ during His earthly sojourn from the time of His birth to that of His return in triumph to His Father on the clouds of Olivet. Now if there be in reality the distinction, which the modernist insists there is, between the Christ of history and the Christ of faith, it should be an exceedingly simple matter to mark off these facts according to the distinction, and thus classify the sayings and doings of His terrestrial career each under its proper heading, showing which belonged to the Christ of history and which to the Christ of faith. Indeed, if the doctrine is to be at all effective, such an alignment would seem necessary for our proper edification and instruction. At the same time nothing could corroborate more strongly the logic of the clear-cut distinction than a clear-cut classification of the facts in accordance with soundly established principles. With a principle that was unfailing there should be no difficulty for any of us in determining almost offhand under what heading should be assigned any particular fact or saying in the Gospel narrative of the life of Christ where the facts are at once so salient and diversified. Yet much as the modernist insists on the distinction, nowhere does he undertake to make such an alignment of facts or to introduce us to such a guiding and unerring principle. Nor can it be said that the principles are so clear and their application so evident that the wayfarer and the unstable may walk surefooted therein. Indeed, so far is this from being the truth that the modernist himself is unsteady and unstable, and his embarrassment and bewilderment in the alignment of the facts are as great as those of the uninitiated. Wavering and uncertainty, hesitancy, doubt are manifest almost in every line, when the modernist comes to make application of his famous distinction. Thus we are told that in the Gospels the modernist “with the eye of criticism can detect the historic Christ, *but not everywhere.*” The words are: “Ainsi, dans les Evangiles, avec l’œil de la critique, nous découvrons le Christ historique, mais non pas partout.”

And again we find the modernist in this same connection reassuring himself as it were that he is really able to distinguish the Christ of history from the Christ of faith, or, what is the same thing to the modernist, from the Christ of legend and of theology, thus unconsciously betraying his uncertainty, and at the same time admitting that the distinction is not quite so self-evident as he would persuade us it is. Here are the words of “Le Programme:” “Nous savons

bien distinguer le Christ de l'histoire du Christ de la légende et de la théologie."

Elsewhere he tells us that "the two elements are very often united in such a manner that one can distinguish, but not separate them: "Les deux éléments sont très souvent tellement unis entre eux qu'on peut bien les distinguer, mais non pas les séparer."

Indeed so vague and shadowy is the distinction that the modernist admits that some of his own colleagues refuse to recognize it at all; nay, they are so provoked by its insipidity that it is with difficulty they abstain from attacking it. The more ardent and refractory spirits have no patience with these paltering distinctions and will not have them on any terms. Hence we see that although the distinction has a clear ring, the ring is wholly misleading. There is the reverse of lucidity when we come to its application.

But what is more, the distinction at first at least seems to have been put forth by the modernist but tentatively and timidly. Even now—like the entire modernist programme—the theory is a haphazard one. Even though he now talks defiantly, the modernist is not sure of his ground. It seems to be an incontinent terror of the so-called higher criticism that has driven him to invent his theory of distinctions as the only means of saving Christianity. Traditional Christianity—the Christianity of the ages—seems to his overwrought fancy to be completely undermined by what, half in awe, half in admiration, he superstitiously calls "*La Critique*." Any port in a storm seems to have been the modernistic motto when it found itself on the high seas of modern criticism. It is this criticism, it appears, which has rendered the modernist completely panic-stricken and which has paralyzed all his powers of logical perception.

"C'est . . . la critique," we are told, "qui nos a amenés à formuler spontanément, quoique d'une manière encore timide et incertaine, quelques conclusions philosophiques, ou plus exactement, à préciser certaines attitudes intellectuelles qui, du reste, n'ont jamais été ignorées de l'apologétique catholique."

From this confession, then, it appears that the modernist, dismayed and overawed by the threatening attitude of "*la critique*," of which he seems to be in mortal dread, felt himself constrained to formulate philosophical conclusions, or, more accurately, to outline intellectual attitudes for the laudable purpose of saving Biblical Christianity; but that his confidence in these conclusions and intellectual attitudes was not unbounded, and that consequently he put them forward only timidly and with uncertainty. With critical science in the ascendant and faith hanging her head for shame, it was unwonted heroism in the modernist to rush in to the rescue and formulate a hypothesis which might snatch Christianity from the awful fate that awaited

her. Timid and uncertain as he was about its value, it was, in his opinion—viewing matters as he did in his state of alarm—it was for Christianity, that or nothing. So doubtful was the remedy that, as we have already seen, some of the more impatient temperaments regarded it as wholly worthless and with difficulty could restrain themselves from assailing it. We read:

“Cela est si vrai, que l’on n’a pas de peine, à trouver parmi nous de savants (mark the modesty of *parmi nous de savants*) qui, réfractaires par tempérament à toute préoccupation synthétique, dédaigneux de toute tentative de conciliation apologétique, font profession de criticisme pur et négligent, s’ils ne les combattent pas, ces nouvelles hypothèses générales que nous enonçons timidement pour réconcilier la foi qui décline avec le science critique qui se renouvelle.”

Manifestly, then, the modernist had little faith in his theories from the start. They were given out in the hour of desperation as emergency remedies or forlorn hopes which even their companions scorned as of no value. This is preëminently true of the theory of “the Christ of faith and the Christ of history.” But the confidence of the theorists seems to have grown with the acceptance of their theories by men who, like themselves, did not have the penetration or the courage to question the methods or challenge the conclusions of the dreadful “la critique;” and now the words of arrogant defiance are in marked contrast with the terms of weakness and timidity which announced the first introduction. Now they boast of it as the new form of apologetics which has “such a profound power of persuasion among their contemporaries.” Here are the words:

“Et c’est pourquoi en acceptant, comme le doivent faire tous ceux qui ont confiance dans le possibilité de conciliation de la science et de la foi, les resultats de la critique avec tout ce côté immuable qu’exige la vérité intrinsèque du Christianisme, nous avons fait appel à quelques nouveaux motifs apologétiques qui nous semblent posséder une profonde force de persuasion auprès de nos contemporains.”

In the present opinion of the modernist, then, his experiment has succeeded even beyond his expectations. What was begun in doubt issues in certainty. The fear and trembling becomes confident assurance, the timidity becomes audacity; what was sown in weakness has arisen in power, but not in the power of theories proven or hypotheses demonstrated, but on the somewhat doubtful premises that their theories have met with an easy acceptance on the part of men who were quite as terror-stricken as themselves. Nevertheless we still find that when it comes to an alignment of the words and works of Christ of the Gospels we are no better off with the aid of



the modernist confident than we were with that of the modernist timid and hesitant. Indeed, some of his assignments are positively startling and not a little bewildering. It is true, of course, that in dealing with such a fact as the resurrection of Christ, there can be no doubt as to the category to which the modernist would assign it, but with such a palpably natural fact as His death, which we might ordinarily expect to find catalogued under the heading of "The Christ of History," the indications are that the modernist would class it rather with the facts in "The Christ of Faith;" for everywhere he seems to associate it, and rightly, with the resurrection. But since he regards the Christ of history as a mere man, the transfer of His death to the realm of faith (which with the modernist is not, as we shall see later on, fact at all, but pure fancy) the logical consequence is a little strange, not to say grotesque. However, there is no doubt about the modernist's classification of the fact. On page 87 we read: "En lui, par le moyen del'histoire, nous reconnaissons l'homme qui a parlé et agi pour notre enseignement; et par le foi, le saveur qui, par sa mort et sa résurrection, nous a donné une vie nouvelle."

This is very perplexing; for to a mortal man—such as they declare the Christ of history to be—nothing can well be more natural than his death; and if we find this transported into the realm of faith (and consequently, if we are to believe the modernist, into the realm of fancy) we at once are bewildered, and, of course, when we come to the other facts less palpably natural of His life as related in the Gospels, we naturally blunder hopelessly.

But while the modernist fails to align the facts in the life of Christ in accordance with his distinction, he leaves us in no doubt about his general wishes and ultimate intentions in the matter. His famous distinction of the Christ of history and the Christ of faith is made out of deference to the agnostic principle in latter-day criticism, which at all hazards he manifestly wishes to conciliate. That principle is the old principle of Hume, which bans and bars from consideration all suggestion of the supernatural. No matter what the evidence for a supernatural fact, according to the agnostic principle, such a fact can have no claim on our recognition. Instead of challenging boldly the illogical position of the defenders of this principle and showing its absurdity, the modernist seems to have succumbed to it completely and made to it an absolute surrender of the supernatural. Consequently to oblige the agnostic the supernatural in Christianity—and in Christ Himself—is withdrawn from history altogether, their supernatural claims at the bar of history are wholly abandoned by the modernist, while the full claim of the agnostic false principle is allowed and its edicts are permitted to be

put into execution. In order to accommodate himself to the agnostic principle, the modernist undertakes to exclude every suggestion of the supernatural from the life of Christ. Accordingly, in theory at least, he assigns to "the Christ of history" what he regards as the actions and words of "Christ the man," taking care, however, not to categorize them. But, on the other hand, the modernist wishes to be before all a devoted Christian and an ardent Catholic, and consequently feels in duty bound to conciliate Christianity as well. What, then, was to be done with the facts of the Gospels? Here they were, sober facts of history, written by sane men, some of whom were themselves eyewitnesses to the facts which they faithfully recorded, while all the recorded events were as duly authenticated as any facts in human history; nay, some of them the best authenticated facts in all history. How dispose of those? With most of them—indeed, it might be said with all of them—the supernatural was so hopelessly intermingled as to defy disentanglement. The modernist's concession to the agnostic, however, had excluded them from consideration as history beyond hope of recall. Yet there they were, the most salient facts in all history. Surely this was a dilemma to stagger most men. *Que faire*, as the French say. But the modernist is nothing if not resourceful. He took counsel with himself and decided that the time had come to take up new positions in the science of theology (a prendre en theologie de nouvelles positions). To prevent his faith from being strangled by the dread higher criticism (afin que la critique ne put pas choquer leur foi), he transfers the entire supernatural element in the Christ of the Gospels, inseparable and often indistinguishable though it be from the human, to the realm of faith; and thus we have "the Christ of faith." Hitherto the Christ of the Gospels was the Christ of faith and, too, the Christ of history; but now these two must be divorced; separation was imperative. Christianity could be saved only by lifting its supernatural elements out of the region of history and lodging them safely beyond danger of molestation from history and its criticism in the mysterious cloud-region of faith. And what a providential thought! Christianity was thus saved. *La foi* and *la critique*, thanks to the modernist's ingenuity, could now clasp hands without a blush—at least on the part of *la critique*. The nuptials of agnosticism and Christianity—impossible though they had seemed—was now an accomplished fact.

But it would be wrong to suppose that the modernist remained satisfied with this compromise, sweeping though it had been. In philosophy as in morals a man seldom remains long superior to his principles. With the modernist, from faith to fiction was but a step, and he was not long in taking this step. All that was supernatural

in the Gospels concerning the sojourn of Christ on earth was transposed, as we have seen, from the realm of historical fact to the region of faith, in order to accommodate the views of the agnostic; and in order to conciliate him still further a further advance still is made; the supernatural is again removed, this time into the realm of fiction. As facts of history everything related to supernatural is incredible and impossible. And even as facts of faith they must be regarded with strong suspicion. But to seriously think for a moment of regarding them as deserving of consideration as historical facts is to deliberately invite the just ridicule of *la critique*, than which the modernist evidently can conceive no greater disgrace.

But, it may naturally be asked, if the Christ of faith be not at all the Christ of history, and only in a vague, indeterminate way even the Christ of the Gospels, what then is the Christ of faith? And it is in working out the answer to this question that the modernist demonstrates at once his lofty genius, his superb intellectuality and his extraordinary capacity for moral dealing even with moral issues. We shall try to epitomize the modernist's answer.

All the truths related in the Gospel history concerning Christ are to be divided into the truths of history and the truths of faith. The truths of history actually occurred; the truths of faith never occurred at all. The truths of history belong to the sensible and natural order, and in this way can be known; the truths of faith belong to the supernatural order, and consequently, we are told, cannot be known except through a supernatural medium. The man Christ (!) belongs to the sensible and natural order, and as such can be known to history; but to Christ, the Son of God, the Messiah, history must be inexorably blind. He belongs to the supernatural order, and consequently, however much history may stumble against Him, He can have no place in history—not even though He occupy so large a place in all human history. Consequently the supernatural events narrated in the Gospels never took place at all. There never occurred any such thing as the changing of water into wine; as walking on the waters; as healing the sick, much less such a thing as the raising of the dead to life, especially His own resurrection from the tomb. The open tomb, the risen Saviour, the discourses with His disciples, the ascension—these were not facts of history at all. The evangelists, it is true, relate these things, and relate them, too, as facts; but we who know better must not mind them. The modernist knows precisely what occurred and how it occurred. But those things which the evangelists describe so elaborately never occurred at all. Nay, what is more, they could not occur, because they are supernatural and could never as such come within the range



of sensible experience. Such is the assurance which the modernist gives us.

But, since these things never happened, how came they to be written down as facts of history? The answer to this question is where the modernist makes his grand *coup d'état*. Thanks to the imagination of the modernist and the "*positions nouvelles*" assumed by him, we have a clear understanding of the whole matter. After the lapse of nineteen hundred years the modernist pushes aside the evangelists who have misled the world by their false representations of historic facts, and quietly tells us what did occur actually; and, what is more, how those things came to be written down as sober history by the evangelists. And it is this:

The Christ of faith occurred. Although all such things as signs and wonders in the life of Christ must be promptly discredited; although we must set our faces like flint against all supposition of such follies as the supernatural in His historical career; although above all we must declare Anathema Maranatha all suggestion of such a thing as a physical resurrection of Christ, nevertheless this same Christ, after His death, in some inexplicable, mysterious manner, gained an ascendancy over the hearts and minds of the people of Judea, so that the man whom they put to death as an impostor and a malefactor became the dominating spirit in their lives. His spirit was in some mysterious manner now united with God, and in some more mysterious manner it was also united with their spirits. In a word, they now believed in Him, had faith in Him; and, strange to say, all the signs and wonders which the modernist tells us were impossible to Him in the flesh, His followers at once begin to imagine concerning Him now that He was dead. This faith was not confined to one or two disciples merely, but spread everywhere and instantly, like wildfire. The modernist does not explain how this happened, it is true, but he assures us of the fact all the same. Each believer began now to have his experiences, and the experiences of faith were so marvelous that they sometimes even surpassed in reality the wonders which the modernist anathematizes in the Gospel history. There was an outpouring of the spirit of Christ upon His followers which manifested itself in their spirits and lives, and the reality experienced by faith came to be the one important feature of their religious faith. Then, too, one believer placed his experience beside that of another believer, and alongside of these a third, and a fourth, and a fifth, each in turn, placed his experience, until out of this comparison of experiences there arose a sort of collective experience, and in this way they arrived at what the modernist terms the collective Christian conscience. To this ferment of faith, however, everything contributed. Perfervid imagination,

strong emotion, overexcitement, overstatement of fact, speculation, even fiction—all had their share in this work of faith experience. No matter what the degree of culture—high or low—its dreams and experiences were free to aid the faith by their additions to the common fund of the experience of the believers. Legends, too, sprang up and were, of course, duly incorporated in the experience of the collective Christian conscience. All seems to have been grist that came to the Christian mill. The main interest centred in what the modernist calls "the reality experienced by faith." But the outcome of all this overheated imagination, all this ferment of excited feeling, all this legend and extravagance of statement, together with what were actual experiences, constituted what the modernist calls the Christ of faith. It was, we are gravely informed, the result of the life of Christ living in His early followers. Thus, for instance, we are told:

"C'est pour cela que, dès le début du Christianisme, on a été libre d'aider la foi au moyen d'explications variées répondant aux divers degrés de culture des fidèles. Tout l'intérêt se trouvait dans le réalité expérimentée par la foi; ses explications et ses spéculations y relatives n'avaient de valeur qu'autant qu'elles servaient à mieux faire comprendre et à vivre la réalité de la foi."

And again we read:

"Toutes ces diverses conceptions qui se succèdent et parfois se superposent l'une à l'autre ont été évidemment imaginées pour expliquer le fait, dont la foi chrétienne a une expérience continue et toujours nouvelles, que le Christ vit en nous et que c'est lui qui baptise dans le Saint Esprit."

Or again:

"Nous avons bien distingué le Christ de l'histoire du Christ de la légende et de la théologie. Mais avec l'oeil de la foi, soit sous le Christ de l'histoire, soit sous celui de la légende et de la théologie, nous voyons partout le Christ selon l'esprit."

Here we see the modernist himself professing a faith in the legendary Christ as in the real Christ, the Christ of faith being discernible by him no matter under what disguise. And once more we are told:

"De même que la vie surnaturelle du Christ dans les fidèles et dans l'Eglise a été revêtue d'une forme historique qui a donné naissance au Christ que nous pourrions appeler, quoique d'un mot inexact, le Christ de la légende, de même aussi cette vie a été assujettie à une élaboration ou explication doctrinale qui a créé le Christ de la théologie ou de la dogmatique."

Thus we see that all the supernatural claims of Christ are swept by the modernist bosom into the land of fiction. His miracles, His

Divine Sonship claimed by Himself, His Messianism, His union with the Father, His resurrection and ascension, the promise of the Holy Spirit, the establishment of His Church, the institution of the sacraments, the commission to His Apostles—all had no actual existence in the real life of Christ. They are all an aftergrowth. They were all the result of the spirit of the dead Christ working on the lives of the first Christians; but they were by no means realities in the life of the Christ of history. They were, perhaps, Christian experiences, and the aggregation of them gave us the Christ of faith. Into the texture of this Christ of faith, as we have seen, strange elements were interwoven. Fiction, legend, imagination, vision, hallucination, daydreams—all had their part and all shared in shaping the concept of the Christ of faith. The gross extravagances of the vulgar were found side by side with the more refined speculations of the cultured, and all were enriched by the splendid fancy of the Oriental imagination. Then there was the old Hebraic notion of the Messiah and the apocalyptic figure which was to come miraculously on the clouds of heaven, both of which the disciples united in the person of Christ. Then, too, the notion of the Son of God, synonymous with the Hebrew expression for the Messiah, in passing over into Greece—a land where men were accustomed to imagine mysterious relations between the divinity and the Grecian warriors—gave rise to the conception of the intimate relations between the Father and the Christ, while the old Hellenic notion of an intermediary between the supreme being and the world suggested the notion of identity in Him also with God the Father to those who were anxiously expecting the redemption of Israel—all, however, culminating in the coalescence of the Messianic idea with the Platonic notion of the *Logos*. These were some, and only some, of the threads that were woven, we are gravely assured, into the fabric of “the Christ of faith.” All had their place in the extraordinary human mosaic which was fast assuming such massive proportions.

Now this Christ of faith is the Christ which the New Testament presents to us. This extraordinary aggregation of religious excitement, Hebraic expectation, Hellenic transfiguration; or, if you will, of imagination, fiction and legend, constitutes the Christ of the Gospels. If we are to believe the modernist, the statements of fact met with in the Gospels never took place at all. Instead, the evangelists took this wonderful combination of subtle Greek thought and vulgar Hebrew excited imagining and set it all down as grave facts of history. Matthew, who had been the companion of our Lord, did not see or hear the wonders of which he wrote; he simply prevaricated. John, who vouched for the reality of the occurrences which he recorded on the strength of the fact that he was an eye-



witness and competent to give testimony on the points of which he wrote, drew on his imagination. Luke, who expressly claimed that he gave the facts of his Gospel on the authority of eyewitnesses, fabled. Even Mark, who, according to the modernistic and higher criticism, wrote what formed a basis for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke—even he gave only the experiences of surcharged Christian feeling for veritable facts of history. The evangelists simply "projected it all into the history of the mortal Jesus," but as fact it never had any actual existence. We are gravely told:

"Or les Evangélistes, pour mieux marquer la dépendance de ces institutions postérieure de l'Esprit toujours vivant du Christ, les projettent dans l'histoire même de Jesus mortel."

What if Matthew were the companion of our Lord? What if Mark could learn the truth of his statements from St. Peter, whose companion he had been? What if Luke had his knowledge directly from St. Paul, and in consequence assures his reader that the contents of his Gospel are true, vouched for on the authority of eyewitnesses of the facts? What if St. John expressly declares that he was competent to give testimony of the truth of his statements? Of what value is it all? Who are the evangelists that their asseverations could be for a moment considered in comparison with the word of the modernist, who, looking through the perspective of two thousand years, is apt to see more clearly and describe more accurately what really took place than a mere eyewitness or paltry contemporary? For, be it remembered, the modernist does not give any reason for his theory and makes no attempt to corroborate his hypothesis. He is simply taking a "new position" because he regards the old one as untenable. And the only real reason why he regards the old one untenable is because it has the hardihood to record supernatural occurrences as facts of history, a thing which the agnostic world will not abide.

Of course, there is much here that is far from new, strange and ingenious as it all is. Strauss and Renan and the later critics had, of course, long familiarized us with the vision and hallucination theories, and the later agnostics have resolutely set their faces against the admission of the supernatural; but we believe the attempt to solve the difficulty in the peculiar fashion of dividing Christ—in direct opposition to St. Paul's protest—the ingenious device by which the facts related in the Gospel are accounted for by claiming them to be merely the experience of the collective Christian conscience projected by the evangelists into the mortal life of Christ, all this is the peculiar invention of the modernist. He is fully entitled to whatever credit there is due to it. But Strauss and Renan and the Tübingen school, as well as the entire school which

calls itself the higher criticism, were at least consistent in their denial. They were logical in rejecting Christ and Christianity altogether when they imagined they had demolished the foundation of the Gospel facts. The modernist, however, wants to eat his cake and have it, too. He wants to demolish the supernatural character in Christ and yet retain Him as his God, his Saviour and his Redeemer! It is difficult to understand the mental twist which can in all seriousness prompt the strange suggestion, perhaps the most curious and extraordinary in the entire history of eccentric hypothesis. The modernistic attitude opens up a view of mentality which is, we believe, entirely new. It is like turning a sharp curve at a high elevation and suddenly coming on a new region whose very existence was undreamed of, and where the landscape is not particularly inviting; nay, is at times positively forbidding.

Let us try to grasp the logic of the entire situation as a whole. The Gospel history is supposed to be a truthful record of actual occurrences. It is perfectly manifest to the reader that the writer in every instance intended that the facts which he related were to be taken as true representations of reality. The narration of the events in the Gospel is, in every instance, intended by the evangelists to be a veritable record of historic facts—facts as real as the crossing of the Alps by Hannibal, the crossing of the Rubicon by Cæsar or the crossing of the Delaware by Washington. They are not given as fiction, or guesswork, or hypothesis. If the evangelists meant anything at all they meant that the reader should take them as a true presentation of actual realities. And now comes the modernist, after a lapse of twenty centuries, and assures us that from his vantage ground of observation the events narrated never occurred at all. The early Christians, the evangelists among them, dreamed dreams, and then the evangelists sat down deliberately and recorded those dreams as actual occurrences. To the ordinary mind there is but one conclusion from all this—that is, if the modernist contention be true—viz., that the evangelists were impostors and, to use a word which has seen much service within the past few years, were mere historical fakirs. Indeed, the charge of fraud is so direct here that if it were made against a contemporary author a suit for libel would be the outcome. The charge is either true or else is a vicious slander on the sacred writers. The evangelists, however, have been dead nearly two thousand years, and their heirs, according to the flesh, might have some difficulty in proving title, while their Christian heirs can only try to defend them against slanderous assaults.

And now comes the startling feature of the case. So far from condemning the evangelists for imposing upon us false history under

the name of fact, the modernist sees nothing wrong in the action of the evangelists at all. Instead of being shocked by the mendacious assurances of the sacred writers, and so far from finding anything reprehensible or immoral in the audacious deception (as the modernist will have it), the modernist undertakes to justify the imposture. This is surely a singular attitude. Instead of branding the Gospel statements as the bold impostures which they tell us they are, the modernist becomes actually the apologist and defender of what he declares to be nothing but evangelistic frauds. The evangelists had a perfect right to palm off on an unsuspecting world the vaporings of overheated imaginations as actual facts. It is true, the modernist feels bound after the lapse of over nineteen hundred years to repair the errors of the evangelists and correct their mistakes and make reparation to the world (pour operer cette reparation, are the modernist's words) for the mistakes of the sacred writers; nevertheless, the evangelist was perfectly justified in his rather crooked proceeding. He had a perfect right to do it. He was quite right in deceiving his readers. Deceiving was even good for them. Surely this is strange moral teaching, and in passing it may be remarked that possibly we have here the key to the modernistic morality and the explanation of his extraordinary insistence on remaining in the Church while preaching a rampant rationalism. However this may be, we are told that the evangelists were quite right—quite as right as were the Pentateuchal writers in attributing all the Jewish laws and institutions to Moses.

"En agissant ainsi ils usent d'un droit plus certain encore que les écrivains du Pentateuch rapportant à Moïse l'origine de toutes les lois et institutions judaïques."

And when we turn to the reasons which, according to the modernist, justify "the writers of the Pentateuch in attributing to Moses the origin of all the Jewish laws and institutions," we find a variety, all of which may be summed up in one briefly: Sacred history must not be regarded seriously. Neither the writers of these histories nor the manner of narration must be held too closely to fact. "Religious history is not history at all in the proper sense of the word"—all of which doubtlessly means that, as there is a discrimination against the supernatural, there is also a conspiracy against sacred history among the rationalistic and agnostic critics of the day in which the modernist cheerfully joins. Extravagance of statement, imagination, even pure fiction, must not be regarded as serious blemishes in such works; they are religious histories. We are told with all apparent gravity that:

"Les livres descriptifs de l'Ancien Testament composés . . . de plusieurs sources racontant diversement les faits et usant en cela



d'une souveraine liberté, soit que cette liberté tienne à la nature de l'auteur ou de la tradition à la quelle il se rattache, ne sont point de l'histoire au sens propre et moderne du mot."

And again:

"On ne doit pas non plus considérer tout élément fictif comme décidément opposé au caractère d'histoire religieuse."

Surely this is an extraordinary statement. Sacred history may romance, then, as much as it pleases; it is good for it. When the evangelists or other writers of sacred or religious history indulge their fancy and treat their readers to the supernatural and the miraculous, false as are their statements, they are not to be reprehended. They are but using their privilege as sacred writers, which seems to be something more than a poetic license; for it admits the intention to deceive. In a word, the evangelists and other sacred writers, as well as the writers of religious history, are a sort of privileged falsifiers, licensed impostors or chartered libertines in the realm of truth, and when they draw the long bow and indulge in extravagance of statement, they are entirely within their prerogatives as writers of religious history.

[ All this is very singular, and we believe is entirely new with the modernist. But it is all the result of his accommodating spirit. He desires, as has been seen, to conciliate the agnostic, who insists on excluding the supernatural, and the Christian, to whom the supernatural is spirit and life. Hence the astonishing shifts to which he has been driven. He essays the difficult feat of riding at the same time two horses going in opposite directions, and, of course, with the usual results. How much easier it would have been, however, to have stood his ground logically. The full force of the absurdity of his position, however, becomes apparent when we remember that all the rubbish which is written as biblical criticism, both by the agnostic and the modernist, crumbles to pieces the moment we admit the supernatural, which cannot be excluded. This once admitted, all the ingenious devices of the modernist, their theories, hypotheses and "new positions," together with all the grave, learned and enlightened methods of the agnostic critics, becomes a mass of puerilities or the important drivel and imposing trifles of senility. How far his yearnings for reconciliation have driven the modernist, and how far from all logical moorings he has drifted, may be understood when we hear him soberly declaring that indeed religious histories wholly or partly imaginary edify us more than those which are strictly true, and that we should attach great value and read with profit the ancient legends of holy men and women, although we know that they are mostly to be traced to the imagination of the pious writer. The exact words are:

"Les histories (religieuses) en tout ou en partie imaginaires édifient davantage que les faits rigoureusement vérifiés et nous avons raison de faire grand cas des antiques légendes des saints et des saintes et de les lire avec profit, bien que nous sachions q'elles contiennent des éléments dont la souce doit être cherchée en grande partie dans l'imagination du pieux écrivain."

The ordinary intellect would, we think, be inclined to say that such histories gave edification precisely in proportion to the amount of truth which they contain, and it is difficult to place oneself *en rapport* with the psychological (or is it hysterical?) constitution which one moment renounces the supernatural altogether and the next, as if to atone for the sacrilege, plunges into the very depths of superstition. To our thinking, the robust, sane, logical mind, though it might be regarded as old-fashioned, would, in dealing with history, whether sacred or profane, brush aside the rubbish of modern elaborate, long-drawn distinctions and say that the facts related in any given history were either true or false, and that no ingenious devices could bolster up the false, much less impart to it the nature of truth. In regard to the facts related in the Gospels generally, and in the life of Christ in particular, a well-balanced intellect would say that the facts related were either true or false, and if shown to be really false, the sooner the books were committed to the flames the better. He would maintain that, like all other history, the writers regarded the truths which they recorded as corresponding with the reality, to use the phrase of "Le Programme," "qu'on la regarde comme une affirmation de la realitie," and that they intended that the reader should so regard them. The evangelists—and no quibbling can evade it—manifestly believed that the facts which they committed to writing concerning the history of Christ on earth constituted true facts of history, and what is still more certain and still more to the point, they intended that their readers should so understand them; and if the modernist can show beyond mere peradventure that either of or both of these positions be untenable, the evangelists were either dupes or prevaricators, their histories are worse than worthless, for they are misleading, and the sooner their books are committed to the flames the better. No ingenuity of the modernist can rescue the records of the New Testament from the degradation, and no good intentions on the part of the modernist can remove from them the stigma of falsehood. Indeed, we prefer the frank brutality of the rationalist and the agnostic, which flatly refuses to recognize the supernatural, to the mincing pietism which offers such pitiable drivel—even though with the best of intentions—as food for thought to full-grown men, and which then turns round and tells us in the same breath that, notwithstanding that they have

tried to convict the New Testament of falsehood, "they will not admit that there are any real errors in the Bible." Read:

"Nous n'admettons aucune erreur proprement dite dans le Bible et encore moins des mensonges, même officieux."

What is to be thought of this style of simpering idiocy? Better Strauss or Renan at their worst than such silly trifling with sacred things!

But this is not the worst. The grade of mentality and intellectual morality which the whole matter throws open to view as prevalent in the modernistic world constitutes an interesting study. All that is supernatural in the life of the Christ of the Gospels is, as has been seen, resolved into the Christ of faith, and, according to the modernist, the Christ of faith is a coalescence of exaggerated statement, over-excited religious enthusiasm, imagination, legend and even fiction. Nevertheless, it must not be forgotten that this is the self-same Christ whom the evangelists have portrayed to us as the real Christ of history. We have already touched upon this point, but it is well to get it clearly in mind. We must try to grasp this strange feature, which, among so much that is confused and vague in the modernist's programme, is so fully elaborated that there is no mistaking the position. This Christ of faith, so curious and fanciful, what is it? Whence comes it? The Christ of history was, we are plainly informed, a mere mortal man—a prophet, if you will. No miracle or superhuman fact, however, can be predicated of the historic Christ, much less any such extravagance of imagination as His resurrection from the dead. How, then, has it happened that the Christ of faith has assumed such gigantic proportions? How has a Christ of fable so imposed upon the evangelists that they should write Him down as the Christ of history, ascribing to Him, as if real and actual, phenomena which never had existence outside the minds of the faithful, and which, at best, were merely the experiences of faith? Here, of course, is where the marvelous logic of the modernist comes into full play. Although Christ was nothing more than a mere man, although miracle or divinity must not be mentioned in connection with His name, although He was neither mediator, nor Redeemer, nor long-promised Messiah, and although the people rejected Him in life and triumphed over Him in His ignominious and painful death, nevertheless in some mysterious unheard-of way He triumphed over them after His death. Without resurrection or miracle, without intervention of the supernatural at all, the spirit of Him dead obtained an ascendancy over those whom He in vain tried to influence when living. The spirit of Him dead accomplished wonders more miraculous than His real physical resurrection could ever have effected. His spirit began to work like a



ferment in the minds of the people of Judea. It wrought upon their imaginations, their spirits, their lives. His life began to exert its influence on their lives, and His spirit began to energize their spirits until marvels and wonders sprang up—at least in the imaginations of the faithful—on every side to such an extent that, from the standpoint of the supernatural, the resurrection itself becomes commonplace in comparison with this greater miracle. And all this—even to the recording of it by the evangelists—is, it must be remembered, the work of the spirit of Christ operating on the spirits and lives of the first Christians. It is all the work of Christ and His spirit. All the various conceptions of Christ which the faithful imagined were, as has been seen, fabricated for the express purpose of explaining the experience of faith.

*"Imaginées pour expliquer le fait, dont la foi chrétienne a une expérience continuelle et toujours nouvelle, que le Christ vit en nous et que c'est lui qui baptise dans le Saint Esprit."*

And again, as before quoted:

*"Ressuscité à une vie nouvelle et spirituelle, il nous communique son esprit, c'est-à-dire qu'il vit en nous de sa vie propre, et non pas seulement en nous pris individuellement, mais bien socialement unis dans l'Eglise, nous initiant ainsi à la vie plus haute qui est la vie future."*

Nay, we are told that in this life of Christ in us is essentially contained the entire essence of Christianity.

*"Dans cette vie du Christ en nous, vie intérieure par la communication de son Esprit et vie extérieure par l'accomplissement de ses commandements, réside toute l'essence du Christianisme."*

Consequently the Christ of faith, though never having had a corresponding reality outside the minds of believers, and although in the last analysis it is but a mass of crude faith, imagination, religious excitement and such like, is all nevertheless the work of the spirit of Christ acting on the spirits of the first Christians, and the work of His life operating on their lives. All the exaggerations, overstatements of fact, religious speculation and imaginings which the modernist tells us is not and never was real fact at all (although gravely written down as such by the evangelists in their different Gospels), is directly traceable to the experience continuous and ever new of faith in the soul of the believer vitalized by the soul of Christ working upon it.

And now comes the very pertinent question: If the facts of the Gospel are not actual and real, and if the experience of them through faith led the early Christians to believe that they were actual when they were only fanciful and true when they were really false and imaginary—if we are to believe the modernist—if all this is due to

the Spirit of Christ acting on the lives of the early Christians, what are we to think of the Spirit of Christ which suggested as fact notions which never had happened at all and could never happen? Is not this a spirit of falsehood rather of truth? Did the Spirit of Christ simply mislead His followers, making them believe as actual occurrences and facts of history matters and events which had no deeper foundation "than the imaginations of the pious" believers?

And then, too, what of the evangelists who wrote these products of the Christian imagination down as actual facts of history? The work of the sacred writers of the New Testament in general and of the Gospels in particular was also a part of the religious ferment caused in the Christian mind by "the operation of the spirit of Christ on their spirits and the working of His life on their lives." Putting aside altogether the fact of divine inspiration in what may be called the technical sense of the term, and which does not come into the question at all, the commitment to writing by the evangelists of the facts which we find in the Gospel is the direct result of the action of the spirit of Christ on the spirits of the evangelists and of His life on their lives. But, as has just been said, according to the modernist, the evangelists have imposed upon their readers and have given to them not the real Christ of history, but the Christ of faith. Like the deceitful nurse who swaps the babes in the nursery, the evangelists have given us spurious facts in the Gospel life of Christ for true ones; they have given us for "the Christ of history" merely "the Christ of faith." But this Christ of faith is but an agglomeration of imagination, over-excited religious feeling, speculation, enthusiasm and highly wrought fancy. Did the Spirit of Christ lead the evangelists to give to the world all this as historical reality? Did the Spirit of Christ mislead the evangelists and cause them to believe that they were writing truth when they were writing mere falsehood? Or did this deceptive spirit simply impart a share of its own sinister nature to the sacred writers, thus influencing them to write down as truth what they knew to be false? This, of course, sounds very irreverent; but it is the modernist, with his warped mentality and even warped notions of intellectual morality, who forces it upon us. There is, however, no escape from these conclusions. The logic is direct and overwhelming which traces back to the action of Christ Himself the evangelistic falsehoods which the modernist tells us have been imposed upon us in the name of true historical fact by the sacred writers.

And there is the further question: What are we to think of the modernist, who, in spite of all this fraudulent and spurious substitution, still professes to be a firm believer in the Christ who has been directly the author of it all? For it must not be forgotten that the

modernist is still a devout believer in the Christ of faith, unhistorical though He be. In this Christ he founds his "hopes of life." In the "life of this Christ in us," "interior and exterior," he places "the whole essence of Christianity." In Him he discovers "the Saviour, who, by His death and resurrection, has given us a new life." He regards this Christ as the being "who alone serves for our salvation." What are we to think of this intellectual, moral and religious jugglery? Is not the plain agnostic or rationalistic infidel logical compared with the modernist in his "nouvelles positions," which he has imagined to prevent Christianity from being strangled by the formidable "la critique?"

Here is his own profession of faith:

"Ce n'est pas de la spéculation théologique en elle-meme, mais du Christ, dont cette spéculation peut nous aider a comprendre la personnalité et la valeur, que nous attendons la vie."

It is then from speculation instead of from history and revelation that we come to grasp the meaning of Christ's personality; but it is from this Christ, however, the modernist expects life. And we find added:

"En lui, par le moyen de l'histoire, nous reconnaissons l'homme qui a parlé et agi pour notre enseignement; et par la foi, la saveur qui, par sa mort et sa résurrection, nous a donné une vie nouvelle."

And lastly we read:

"Mais avec l'oeil de la foi, soit sous le Christ de l'histoire, soit sous celui de la légende et de la théologie, nous voyons partout le Christ selon l'esprit dont les Evangélistes, en composant leurs livres, ont exclusivement cherché à répandre la connaissance, comme étant celle qui, seule, sert à notre salut."

In spite of it all, then, the modernist seeks for salvation through the Christ that was not God, nor mediator, nor Saviour, nor Redeemer; that did not rise from the dead, performed no miracle, established no Church, instituted no sacraments or other means of divine grace, could lay no claim to the supernatural—in a word, who was but the mere Christ of history, a mere man, or, at best, a prophet, yet who nevertheless mysteriously influenced the evangelists that they attributed, in all grave sincerity, all those impossible things to Him, and who so worked on the minds of His followers that He persuaded them that this mass of falsehood and imagination was really divine reality. In spite of it all, the modernist finds in Him all these, marvelous though it may seem, and in Him all his hopes of life and salvation as well. Compared with this new position, the new philosophy of "Pragmatism," which gives such chameleon hues to truth that it shines effulgent even under the rays of darkest falsehood, is logical and plausible.



Such are some of the results of the warped mentality which we find in the modernist world. An examination of even the flimsy reasons which the modernist puts forward to lend color of justification to his absurd speculations will, we think, demonstrate still more fully this condition of warped intellectual development. It will also show plainly the depth of the boasted intellectuality which has undertaken to educate the rest of the Christian world. Not many feet of plumb-line will be needed to take the deepest soundings. But to make an adequate examination of these reasons will require another article.

SIMON FITZSIMONS.

Lima, N. Y.

## Book Reviews

---

CARMINA. By T. A. Daly, author of "Canzoni." 12mo., pp. 193. New York: John Lane Company.

Mr. Daly does not need an introduction to persons of good taste. His merit was recognized almost in spite of himself. For a long time he sang for his own amusement, and then for the amusement of a comparatively small circle of friends in *The Catholic Standard and Times*, which he manages so ably. It can hardly be said that he sought public favor; it would be nearer the truth to say that public favor sought him. Songs like his cannot be confined by time, or race, or country, or station. They cannot be restrained by the narrow limitations of language. They are so human that they appeal to man, who is nine-tenths the same throughout all nations, races and times. The music of the human heart never changes, and it appeals to every human being. Mr. Daly is very skillful with that most perfect musical instrument. It is not surprising that his poems are already known and loved throughout the English-speaking world, and that they are beginning to be sung in foreign tongues.

The new collection is almost altogether new. It is divided into four parts—Italice, Hibernice, Anglice and Songs of the Months. The first part is devoted to the inimitable Italian dialect poems, which probably have done more to help persons to see the better side of the Italian emigrant than learned essays could have done. The second part is made up of Irish dialect poems, no less pleasing and useful in their way than the others. In the third part we have poetry of a more legitimate kind, using the word in a technical sense, and the book closes with a song for each month that is full of atmosphere.

Mr. Daly is developing every day. While he has already given us much that is very good, the best is yet to come.

---

LE HACHICH. Par Raymond Meunier. Paris, Bloud et Cie, 1909. Pp. 217.

It is still one of the unsolved problems both of philosophy and of science why it is that human beings, from the remotest ages down to our own time, and probably not less to-day than of yore, delight in violent and stupifying intoxication. Two answers have been proposed corresponding to the double influence, stimulative or depressive, of toxicants. On the one hand, some seek in their favorite poison surcease of pain or sorrow—"respite and nepenthe

from the memory of Lenore;" on the other hand, some take to drugs because they love the excitation or the temporary exaltation of their mental faculties.

Prescinding from the case in which the toxicant is taken as a mere anæsthetic, neither of these answers solves the problem. Each simply states a fact, but gives no reason therefor. Perhaps no reason can be given, since the matter in question is one of the primary facts of experience, answering in the abnormal order to the gratification of natural appetites in the normal. The origin of the abnormality doubtless must be assigned to original sin and its consequent disorganization of human tendencies. Be this as it may, the study of the phenomena of intoxication, produced by whatever substance, has an interest for the psychologist as well as for the physiologist and physician. Such a study is presented in the book above introduced. The author thinks that "hashish"—an extract from India hemp—is a substance whose peculiar influence on consciousness best enables the student to follow the stages and the mechanism of intoxication. Its active principle, the chemical nature of which is still but imperfectly known, produces a somewhat persistent state of inebriation, which consists first of a phase of excitation, associated with delirium, with lucid intervals, and, secondly, of depression. Repeated use of the drug results in a chronic "hashishism"—a disease of the cerebral cortex and the medulla oblongata—which is apt to end in various forms of persistent insanity—the price human beings must pay for their fitful indulgences of sensuality. However, like most other drugs which the perversity of men so wantonly wrests to their own destruction, hashish has its legitimate use, so that when administered with discretion its effects may be beneficial in certain physical as well as psychical disorders.

M. Meunier's essay, like the preceding volumes of the collection to which it is the latest addition ("*Bibliothèque de Psychologie Experimentale et de Métapsychie*"), addresses physicians, professors, special students and serious well educated readers. To these, and to these only, the book appeals.

---

CATHOLICITY IN PHILADELPHIA. From the Earliest Missionaries Down to the Present Time. By *Joseph L. J. Kirlin*, priest of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. 8vo., pp. 546, illustrated. Philadelphia: John J. McVey.

This is a very notable contribution to the history of the Church in the United States. The importance of the Diocese of Philadelphia, measured by its age, its development, its size and its location, is so great as to make its story one of the most interesting chapters in the history of the Church in this country. The author rightly



concluded that it could not be well written or rightly understood unless it stretched back to the beginning, and therefore he covers the whole ground and calls his book "Catholicity in Philadelphia." It would be impossible to write a complete and detailed history in so small a space. This is especially true in regard to the parishes. Indeed, the author has not done more than give a sketch in a few words of the beginning of most of the parishes. For this reason also the work does not pretend to be full biographically. Only those priests are mentioned who have been connected with special work, and in the sketches of parishes, only rectors, as a rule.

The book is strongest in the history of the early Church of Philadelphia. It is weakest in not pushing things to completeness. For instance, in the account of the process of beatification of Venerable Bishop Neumann, mention is made of only one commission during the apostolic process, whereas there were two, and the names of some of the most prominent officials who were longest and most intimately connected with the work are not mentioned at all.

Father Kirlin deserves great credit for his work. He is especially well fitted for it, being a man of good literary ability, and he labored indefatigably for at least six years to gather materials and knit them together. During part of that time he was assistant rector in one of the largest city parishes, with its urgent demands and frequent distractions, and more recently he has been engaged in forming a new city parish, with all the worries and anxieties that beset the new pastor.

The wonder is, not that his work lacks perfection, but that it approaches so close to it. The book is splendidly made—thick creamy paper of light weight, with broad margin; large, clear type, with a quiet dignity that becomes so serious a work; excellent half-tones, several reproductions from paintings, and the whole becomingly and strongly bound. It is a book which ought to be in every parish house in the province, in every Catholic educational institution in the country, in all the larger secular educational institutions, and in all the public libraries.

---

STUDI E RICERCHE INTORNO A S. GIOVANNI CRISOSTOMO; a cura del comitato per il XV. Centenario della sua morte. Fasc. II.-III. Roma, Libr. Pustet, New York, 1908.

The general character of this work was described in a previous number of the REVIEW in connection with a notice of the first fasciculus. Of the two portions here presented the first contains the essays (prepared for the celebration of the fifteenth centenary of the saint's death) relating to the liturgy of Chrysostom, the

origin and development of the liturgy and of its texts (Greek, Armenian, Arabic), the Byzantine liturgy in the Melkite Patriarchates, (Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem), the various versions (Roumanian, Syriac, Slavic, the Ruthenian modifications).

The third, the concluding fasciculus, contains besides the Greek text of a hitherto unpublished discourse on the chains of St. Peter, attributed to St. Chrysostom, two papers on the cult and the iconography of the saint and an elaborate dissertation on the remains and various sacred relics pertaining to him.

The three fasciculi are paged to bind into one stately quarto—a volume that both for its wealth of biographical and historical material as well as for the splendid form in which it is presented is a worthy tribute to the memory of the saintly hero to whom it is dedicated and a monument to the scholarship and munificence of the authors and the makers of the work.

---

HISTOIRE DES DOGMES. Vol. II. De St. Athanase a St. Augustin (318-430).  
Par J. Tixeront. Paris, Victor Lecoffre, 1909. P. 538. Pr., 3½ francs.

One can hardly exaggerate the present importance of positive theology—of that branch or rather method of expounding the truths of divine revelation which traces them to their sources in Scriptural and ecclesiastical tradition and manifests their development in the writings of the early Fathers and Doctors of the Church. Not only does the historical sense, ever growing in the religious as well as in the secular spheres of learning, demand this recurrence to original sources, but the mistrust or at least misappreciation of scholasticism renders it imperative to develop more the positive elements and channels of doctrine. Of course, the well informed student knows how to evaluate both sides of theology—the scholastic and the positive, the speculative and the historical—seeing as he does that the two aspects or methods of theology are mutually supplementary and both necessary to complete and give concreteness to a system of what St. Thomas calls *sacra doctrina*. In answer to this growing demand for positive theology we are getting a steady supply of solidly learned works. Germany has recently produced a number and France has taken them into her language and added others no less meritorious. Of them all perhaps none is more valuable than M. Tixeront's "Histoire des Dogmes," the second volume of which is here introduced. The preceding portion of the work deals with the Antenicene theology. The volume is now in its fifth edition. The present volume follows the history of doctrine through the fourth and the first third of the fifth century. Having drawn a

general sketch of Greek and Latin theology during the fourth century, the author analyzes the heresies pertinent to that period in the East (Arianism, Apollinarianism) and subsequently in the West (Donatism, Priscillianism, etc.). The positive doctrines are treated topically and analytically, the teaching of the individual Fathers being grouped under didactic headings. Exceptions to this method are made in the case of the Syrian writers (Aphraat and S. Ephreme) because of their language, and St. Augustine because of the great comprehensiveness of his teaching. Besides the table of contents there is a very good analytical index—a feature not too often found in French books—which enables the reader at once to survey the teachings of the individual Fathers as well as to follow the history of the individual doctrines themselves from the year 318 to 430. The present volume, therefore, closes at the death of St. Augustine. A concluding volume, now in course of preparation, will carry the investigation down to Charlemagne, the limit of the author's design. Not the least valuable feature of the book is the table of the works of St. Augustine cited in the volume—the list showing at once the date of their completion and their position in the Latin Patrology. While the work has primarily in view the needs of professional students of theology, it is one which the average cultivated reader can peruse with comparative ease and certainly with profit, the author having the peculiarly French art of making the rough ways plain.

---

THE CATECHISM IN EXAMPLES. By *Rev. D. Chisholm*. Five volumes, 12mo., net, \$1.50 each. Vol. I., Faith: The Creed; Vol. II., Hope: Prayer; Vol. III., Charity: The Commandments; Vol. IV., Grace: The Sacraments; Vol. V., Virtues and Vices. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The appearance of the fifth volume of "The Catechism in Examples," which completes the new edition, revised and enlarged, emphasizes the value of the work and calls for additional notice. One of the most striking features of the book is its completeness. It covers the whole course of Christian doctrine, furnishing examples for all the truths as they are presented and furnishing them abundantly, not under a few general headings, from which the instructor must gather them to make the special application himself, but in the most specific manner, fitting them to each chapter, to each answer, and sometimes even to parts of answers.

Another striking feature of the examples is their aptness. They really illustrate the truths to which they are attached, and they do it quickly and clearly. They are never long and sometimes they are very short. They are not obscured by exordiums and perora-



tions, for the sake of literary display, but without useless waste of words the example is skillfully culled from its source and set before the student so logically and attractively as to force home the truth which it is intended to illustrate, while the truth is fresh in the pupil's mind.

A third strong feature of the collection is its variety. The examples are chosen from every legitimate source—the Sacred Scriptures, philosophy, theology, history (sacred and profane), biography (sacred and profane), legend and fiction, the natural sciences—every field yields something to the harvest which is rich and tempting enough to furnish an intellectual feast for the hungry minds of boys and girls innumerable. The wonder is how did the author ever gather so many examples together and how did he classify them?

These are not the only features of the book that are worthy of notice, but they will suffice to show its indispensable worth. Catechism alone is dry and hard, but the teacher or instructor who uses these examples can make it easy and pleasant.

---

**THE SCIENCE OF ETHICS.** By *Rev. Michael Cronin, M. A., D. D.*, professor Clonliffe College, Dublin. Vol. I.: General Ethics. 8vo., pp. xx.+660. Dublin: Gill & Son. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The author says: "The main purpose of this work on Ethics is to present to students of ethical science a full and connected account of the ethical system of Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas. To this system the author gives his fullest assent and adherence, and adherence which is no mere blind acceptance of a tradition, but comes of a conviction, which has grown stronger and clearer with time and study, that the Aristotelian and Scholastic system is the only true ethical system; that it is unrivaled by any other theory, and that it will survive every other theory."

This is certainly a plain, clear statement, and it tells in a paragraph the purpose of the book and its general purpose. It is not to be supposed, however, that the work is in any sense limited in its fullness by its orthodoxy. The author tells, and his declaration is verified by his accomplishment, that he has studied all the great modern systems of Ethics. He devotes 230 pages to the examination of current systems. This is an unusually good feature of the book, and in this department the two chapters devoted to evolution stand out as exceptionally clear and convincing.

This characteristic runs all through the book. The author has the rare quality, especially in subjects of this kind, of excluding irrelevant matter and carrying his reader right to the heart of the question, which he dissects like a skilled and expert anatomist.

The book is very good and is sure to attract widespread notice and excite favorable comment. We shall await the second volume with a great deal of interest.

---

THE CATHOLIC WHO'S WHO FOR 1909. Edited by *Sir F. C. Burnand*. 12mo., 550 pages, cloth, net, \$1.50. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The first edition of the English Catholic "Who's Who," which appeared in 1908, was excellent; the second one for 1909 is better. It has all the excellencies of the former book and many new ones. The editors and compilers are gaining in experience, which counts for much in all kinds of work. Their lists will become more complete with time, the allotment of space will be done more judiciously, they will grow more familiar with their subjects, who will stay with them for probably several years, and little inaccuracies, which are sure to creep into a work of this kind, will be detected and removed.

In the present volume we notice the names of several Americans and others who are not English, or don't belong to the British Kingdom. We fear the editors will have trouble deciding who shall enter if they wander too far.

All the good things which were said of the 1908 edition may be repeated with emphasis concerning the new book. It is not only a complete collection of short biographical sketches, which is indispensable for consultation and which may be read with profit, but it is also a collection of much literary and social information, made up of expressions of personal appreciation on the part of the able literary editor, who has personal knowledge of a very large number of the subjects, and literary anecdotes and sparks of humor. Altogether it is a splendid example of what such a book should be, and we hope that the American Catholic "Who's Who" will equal it in excellence.

---

HISTOIRE DU CANON DE L'ANCIEN TESTAMENT DANS L'EGLISE GRECQUE ET L'EGLISE RUSSE. Par *M. Jugie* des Augustins de l'Assomption. Libraire Gabriel Beauchesne et Cie, rue de Rennes, 117, Paris.

This work shows that the so-called Orthodox Church of the East is not justly entitled to the reputation it enjoys for its supposed immutability. People usually imagine that apart from the old-time quarrels between the Greeks and Latins, which subsisted in the Middle Ages and still subsist, there exists on all other points of doctrine the fullest accord between these two Churches. For some time at the period of the Reformation the Oriental Church successfully repelled the attacks of Protestantism. But since the sixteenth

century, owing to the want of a central vigilant and infallible authority, it has failed to maintain the struggle. The history of the canon of the Old Testament in the Greek Church and in the Russian Church furnishes a striking demonstration of this fact.

The book contains four chapters. The first deals with the canon of the Old Testament in the Byzantine Church after the Council in Trullo; the second, with the canon of the Old Testament in the Greek Church and in the Russian Church in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; the third, with the same canon in the Russian Church since the eighteenth century; the fourth, with the same canon in the Greek Church since the eighteenth century.

The whole work manifests the powerlessness of the Orthodox Church to keep intact the deposit of Revelation. Its perusal brings clearly before the reader the indispensable need for the true Church of God to have an infallible Head, whose vigilant eye detects and unmasks error at its first appearance and protects forever the sacred deposit of faith.

---

THE LAW OF THE CHURCH AND GRAVE. The Clergyman's Handbook of Law. By *Charles M. Scanlan, LL. B.*, author of "Scanlan's Rules of Order," "Law of Fraternities," "Law of Hotels," etc. 12mo., pp. 265. Benziger Brothers, New York.

"The three learned professions, medicine, law and theology, overlap; and a man who does not know something of the other two cannot be prominent in his own. Laws relating to church matters are scattered through such a vast array of law books that it would be a burden for a clergyman to purchase them, and without special training he would not know where to look for the law. Therefore a law compendium covering those subjects relating to church matters must be of great value to a clergyman."

The author's purpose was to produce such a compendium, and his guiding star has been harmony. All law tends to good order, and therefore there should be no conflict between Church and State.

The author does not give a great multitude of authorities, but he furnishes enough to sustain the text, and the citations given are sufficient to guide the way. Brief statements of the rules of law characterize the book. The work is admirably arranged, and the full table of contents, with an exhaustive index, make the way easy and pleasant.

---

MEDICINA PASTORALIS in usum Confessariorum et Curiarum Ecclesiasticarum. Auctore *Joseph Antonelli*, Sac. Naturalium Scientiarum Doctore et Professore. 3 Volumina, 8vo., \$6.50. Neo-Eboraci: Fred. Pustet.

The new edition of the full and complete work on "Pastoral Medicine," by Rev. Joseph Antonelli, which has just come from the



press of Frederick Pustet, is worthy of very special attention. We have had several works on the subject in recent years, but most of them have been on certain phases of it only, and none of them, as far as we know, has pretended to be exhaustive. Father Antonelli's book is exceptional in this regard—it is full, complete and exhaustive. It is profusely illustrated, many of the drawings being colored, and is a really scientific work. The priest who has it need not look for anything else on the subject, for he will find in it clear and concise answers to all questions which may confront him in this field.

The third edition has been brought down to date. Changes have been made in some of the drawings, all decisions of the Sacred Congregations have been considered and much additional matter has been added. It is not likely that Father Antonelli's work will be superceded for a long while. No priest's library is complete without a reliable book on this subject, and this is the book.

---

NEW SERIES OF HOMILIES FOR THE WHOLE YEAR. By *Right Rev. Jeremias Bonomelli, D. D.*, Bishop of Cremona. Translated by *Right Rev. Thomas Sebastian Byrne, D. D.*, Bishop of Nashville. Four volumes, 12mo., each about 300 pages. New York: Benziger Brothers.

We are glad to place before our readers this exceptional sermon book. On several occasions we have said that we look on the multiplication of sermon books as an evil, because very few of them are by exceptionally good preachers or interpreters of the Sacred Text, and most of them are quite ordinary and not worthy of frequent use or imitation. The farther away we get from the Divine Word, the less we are benefited unto salvation. Moreover, we have always contended that every man who is worthy of ordination ought to be able to teach his people the eternal truths, and to bring them to God. We might go further and say that if he is not able to do this and is not doing it, he does not know the eternal truths himself and is not drawing nearer to God. If he meditates, if he says Mass devoutly, if he reads his Breviary faithfully, if he prays, he will preach well, and nothing can stop him. Therefore we are opposed to sermon books as a rule, and we believe they do more harm than good, if they prevent preachers from preaching God instead of preaching somebody else, and we fear they do. The reproduction of thought may be compared to the reproduction of a photograph. In both cases the oftener the reproduction is made the less clear and true the picture will be.

The book before us is the exception to the rule in sermon books, principally because it is not a sermon book in the strict or ordinary

sense of the word. It is a return to the old homily of the early centuries of the Church and her great doctors; to the plain, unvarnished explanation of the literal meaning of the Sacred Text, and its application to present needs, without bothering about other meanings which are not essential and which are often arbitrary and distracting. This was the spirit which moved the Fathers of the Council of Trent when they enjoined on pastors and those who take their place to explain to their people *briefly* and *clearly*, every Sunday and holy day, the Gospel or some part of what is read in the Holy Mass. This was the spirit that moved Bishop Bonomelli to prepare this series of homilies on the Gospels and Epistles of the Sundays of the ecclesiastical year.

Those who are familiar with Bishop Bonomelli's pastorals on religious worship will understand the excellence of this series. The Bishop writes clearly, strongly and right to the point without wasting a word. He has something to say, he knows what it is and how to say it, and he says it. The book can be recommended to preachers without exception. It will do immense good.

We owe a debt of gratitude to Bishop Byrne for an excellent translation. He has preserved all the good qualities of the original without violence to the English translation. We shall close this notice with a lengthy quotation from the book, which we consider too good to need an apology:

"In all the homilies that I have seen," says the Bishop, "I have uniformly found an explanation only of the Gospel of the current Sunday. This has been the common and universal custom for some centuries back, but we know that the Fathers of the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries explained to the people in the form of homilies not only the Gospel, but also the Epistles and other canonical books of the Old and New Testaments. Of this, Origen, St. John Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine and St. Gregory the Great are an incontestable proof. And why should we not do the same now? It seems to me that it would be a good and wise thing to do, if for no other reason than because this bit of novelty, if it may be so called, will excite a laudable and a profitable curiosity in the hearers, will increase their knowledge of the Sacred Scriptures and give them an opportunity to enjoy its beauties. I have thought that I shall do a good and an acceptable work if in my Series I add to the homily on the Gospel one on the Epistle of the current Sunday. The fifty-two Sundays of the year will give fifty-two homilies on the Gospel and fifty-two on the Epistles, or one hundred and four in all; and since the year is divided liturgically into four seasons, I have distributed these hundred and four homilies into four volumes, each containing twenty-six.

"In explaining the books of Scripture we should make every endeavor to ascertain the true and precise sense which the Holy Ghost intends to convey to us, for this and this alone is the word of God. Other senses, which may be derived from passages of the Bible, we respect and receive with reverence, but our duty and our chief and direct aim should be to get at the true and literal sense, since only then are we really giving an explanation of the Sacred Scriptures. But as a rule what is done by those who profess to explain Sacred Scripture in a homily? They collect together at random certain moral truths, which they derive from the Sacred Text as they might from any profane author, and having done this much they are content. They will certainly have stated many truths, excellent if you will, but they are not the truths taught in the Gospel and in the Epistle by Jesus Christ and the Apostles, and these, above all, are the truths we should seek to find. The homilies, however, which I have the honor of setting before you will, I am confident, have this merit—they will be an elucidation of the true and literal text of the Gospel and Epistles. It is hardly necessary to say that I shall strive as best I can to make the moral applications, so necessary for the people, and they will be solidly grounded on the literal sense of the text. I shall say nothing or very little of the mystical sense, for the reason that an occasion to do so will rarely present itself, and if it should it is not always easy to make the sense clear or to deduce from it any profitable lesson."

---

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH: From Its Foundation to the End of the Third Century. By *Monsignor Louis Duchesne*, Hon. D. Litt., Oxford, and Litt. D., Cambridge, Membre de l'Institut de France. Rendered into English from the fourth edition. 8vo., pp. xx.+428. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

The first impression in favor of this book is made by the knowledge that a second edition was called for two months after the appearance of the first. The reputation of the author is its second recommendation. Its third is its subject matter. There is a fascination for the historical student about those early ages of faith, with their heroic characters, who stand out so clearly after centuries, and who defy the ravages of time more surely than figures of bronze or stone. Monsignor Duchesne recognizes the value of original sources; witness his reference to Eusebius:

"At the time of Diocletian's persecution, when the churches were destroyed, the sacred books burned and the Christians proscribed, or forced to apostatize, one of their number was quietly working away at the first History of Christianity. His was not a mind of the highest order, but he was patient, hard-working and conscien-



tious, and during many long years he had collected materials for his contemplated book. He succeeded in saving these materials from the general shipwreck, and even in turning them to account. Thus Eusebius of Cæsarea became the father of ecclesiastical history. And the first duties of those who take up the same task again—so long after, but in days not much less dark—is to recall his name and his incomparable services. But for his unrivaled diligence in searching through those Palestinian libraries, where the learned Origen and Bishop Alexander had collected the whole Christian literature of early days, our knowledge of the first three centuries of the Church's life would be small indeed. We cannot, of course, but lament the destruction of these libraries, yet, thanks to him, and to the remarkable fragments he preserved, we can appreciate in some measure what they were."

But Eusebius is not the only witness to the treasures of this ancient literature. Several of the early books he mentions have come down to us, and others have been read and passed on, by painstaking students like St. Epiphanius, St. Jerome and Photius. It is possible, therefore, to write the literary history of Christianity from the earliest times.

After referring to others who have labored successfully in this field, the author mentions, with special commendation, the honest and judicious Tillemont, who based his treatises on the most conscientious study of all the sources of information available towards the end of the seventeenth century. Although much has been discovered since then, the progress of research has not essentially or even greatly modified the tradition set forth in his learned volumes. Nevertheless, many wild theories have been broached from time to time, and only the skillful, conscientious historian is able to steer a safe course. Monsignor Duchesne adopted a wise plan. He says, speaking of the extremes of historical declaration:

"But there is a middle position represented by the judgment of serious, right-minded men, which commends itself to the common sense public. I need not say that I believe that position to be mine; I may deceive myself. But the folly of some of the theories is as repugnant to me as to the foolishness of some of the legends. I think if I had to choose I should prefer the legends, for in them at least there is always some poetry and something of the soul of a people."

His purpose is to explain and popularize his subject, and he believes he is justified in this by the great progress of learned research. Therefore, although he has consulted all authorities and sifted them well, he has not permitted himself to be led into discussions. In speaking of this, he says:

"Sensible and understanding people will comprehend why I have not encumbered my text with discussions and bibliography, why I have not lingered long over the very first beginnings, and why, without entirely ignoring theologians and their work, I have not devoted overmuch attention to their quarrels."

The book will well repay reading and re-reading, and it is worthy of a place on the permanent historical shelf.

---

THE PATH WHICH LED A PROTESTANT LAWYER TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.  
By *Peter H. Burnett*. Edited and abridged by Rev. James Sullivan, S. J.,  
professor of theology in the St. Louis University. 12mo., pp. xxli. + 425.  
St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder.

This book is known by name and reputation to two generations. It was first published fifty years ago, and it is known wherever the English language is spoken. It could hardly be called exaggeration to say that it is a classic in controversial literature. It was never needed more than at the present time, when creeds are springing up and changing and dying with frightful rapidity. Dr. Brownson's review of the first edition is well worth quoting. He said in 1860:

"The Appletons have, since the beginning of the year, published the anxiously looked for work of Governor Burnett, of California, giving his full reasons for becoming a Catholic. It is the work not of a priest, nor of a professional theologian, but of a clear-headed, strong-minded lawyer, who has not suffered the law to make him forget he has a soul, or to stifle his conscience. It is written in a clear, forcible and unpretending style, in a straightforward, earnest manner, and is to be judged not as a mere literary performance, but as the grave utterance of a man who really has something to say and is pressed by an internal necessity to say it.

"What strikes the reader at a glance in this remarkable volume is its perfect honesty and sincerity. As you read it you feel that the eminent jurist is honestly retracing the path and detailing the successive steps by which he actually came into the Church. The argument of the book is presented under the legal form, by the Judge who sums up the case and gives his decision, rather than as presented by the advocate. It is an argument addressed to reason and good sense, not to passion and sensibility; and we cannot conceive it possible for any fair-minded man to read it and not be convinced, although we can conceive that many a man may read it and not acknowledge himself convinced."

Such a review from such a man is the highest commendation. No one was better fitted to pass on works of controversy than Dr. Brownson. Time has required some changes, which have been

judiciously made by Father Sullivan. The book as it now meets the reader has been reduced to one-half of its original size. This task was rendered easy by the omission of the lengthy and frequent quotations, subsidiary arguments and repetitions that the eminent jurist, unjustly to himself, evidently considered necessary to a clearer understanding of explanation and lines of reasoning that were sufficiently plain in the first instance.

---

THE LORD'S PRAYER AND THE HAIL MARY. *Points for Meditation.* By Stephen Beissel, S. J. 12mo., pp. 227. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder.

Spiritual writers universally agree that it is best to go to the fountain heads for subjects of meditation. Hence the Gospels, the Imitation of Christ, the approved prayers and the Roman Missal are to be preferred to all other sources. Father Beissel recognized this truth, and hence his book. He says:

"This book does not provide finished meditation nor yet sermons, but points or material for meditation. Each meditation comprises three points with clearly defined sub-divisions, and is calculated to occupy a quarter of an hour. Priests who have used these points for their private meditations will find it easy to develop from them short addresses or sermons."

The author begins with an excellent chapter on meditation, and then he takes up each part of the two prayers and develops it beautifully. The book is most attractive and most useful, because it deals with familiar truths in a pleasing manner, and because it leads one inevitably to good resolutions, which should be the end of all meditation. Finally, it is exceptional in its universal adaptability. It is suitable to the Pope as well as to the humblest of his subjects.

---

THE HISTORY OF THE PASSION OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. Explained and applied to Christian life by *James Groenings*, priest of the Society of Jesus. Second revised edition. 12mo., pp. 461. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder.

This translation from the German is well worth reprinting. It is not a large, elaborate, exhaustive work, but a liberal history. All approved sources have been used, and the result is a very striking direct history, with thought provoking moral reflections at the end of each chapter. The author thus states his purpose:

"This book is not, strictly speaking, a series of sermons or meditations on the sufferings of our Redeemer, but it is rather an explanation of the history of the Passion. It consists of a description of the most important and most interesting trial which has ever come



before a court of justice, on whose final decision depends the weal or woe of the whole human race. The book is also a commentary on the greatest drama which has ever been enacted. Even considered from a purely natural point of view, the Passion of Our Lord is a drama with which none other can be compared as regards the character of the actors, the magnitude of the action, the importance of the intrigue and the complexity of the plot. The unities of time and place have been preserved."

---

**HISTORICAL NOTES ON ENGLISH CATHOLIC MISSIONS.** By *Bernard W. Kelly*, author of "The Life of Cardinal York," "The Conqueror of Culloden," "James III. and VIII.," "The Fate of Glengary," etc. 12mo., pp. 455. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. St. Louis: B. Herder.

This is good historical work. Not pretentious or showy, but of a solid fundamental kind. The book is arranged in dictionary form, a short sketch of the missions being given in alphabetical order on double column pages. The work is by no means exhaustive, but some details have been given of the Catholic missions in the country from the breach with the Apostolic See to our own times. The story of the English Catholics, or the "Romance of the Recusants" as it has been termed, during that long period of trial and proscription forms as interesting a narrative as any to be found in the pages of modern history. The historical introduction of forty-three pages is very interesting and instructive and creates an atmosphere for what follows. The book is a valuable addition to a group that is growing and forming an historical groundwork on which future histories will be built.

---

**THE WORLD IN WHICH WE LIVE.** By *R. J. Meyer, S. J.*, author of "First Lessons in the Science of the Saints." 12mo., pp. 407. St. Louis: B. Herder.

This is the second volume of a series which deals with the all important question of man's destiny. The series is thus explained:

"The volume herewith presented to the public is the second part of a work whose subject matter, as outlined in the general introduction, may be expressed in this one sentence: 'How man, such as he is, must rise above the world in which he lives, towards God for whom he was created.' The first part which appeared in print in the year 1902, treats of man, such as he is; the second part, which is now given to the press, treats of the world in which he lives; the third part, which is to follow in due course, treats of God for whom he was created."

The ground covered is most important. Every man should keep

these three questions before his mind constantly, and yet very many never think of them. Father Meyer is showing in a clear, convincing manner their great importance.

"The main object of the present volume, as the title implies, is to depict the world as it appears to the eyes of faith, with a special view to the dangers to which those are exposed who live in it. The means which should be used in order to escape those dangers are to be treated in detail in the third and last volume. In the present volume, however, the principal means are briefly indicated and the way is pointed out along which we should walk in order that we may so pass through the goods of time as not to lose those of eternity."

If a book of this kind could be introduced into all the secular colleges and universities of the country, how immensely the students would be benefitted. At least an effort should be made to get such books into the hands of all Catholic students at non-Catholic schools. This could be accomplished if priests kept in touch with Catholic publications and recommended them strongly to Catholic parents according to the special needs of their sons and daughters. We are not saying that the clergy do not do their duty in this respect, but we are calling attention to a need and the remedy.

ROUND THE WORLD. A Series of Interesting Illustrated Articles on a Great Variety of Subjects. Vol. VI., pp. 211, with 87 illustrations. New York: Benziger Brothers.

We are glad to see that Benziger Brothers are keeping up this very interesting and instructive series of books. The field is indefinitely large, and the series has not begun to be exhausted. The present volume is fully as interesting as its predecessors. It treats of eleven subjects, the principal ones being: "Italy's Beautiful Lakes," "Afloat With Seagoers," "The Cliff Dwellers," "Handling Mail for Millions," "Folklore of Italy," "Gemlore."

WE PREACHED CHRIST CRUCIFIED. Considerations and Meditations for Boys. By *Herbert Lucas, S. J.* 12mo., pp. 328. London and Edinburgh: Sands & Co. St. Louis: B. Herder.

The title is rather misleading, or, rather, it is not informing. It describes the first of a collection of meditations consisting of forty dealing with a variety of subjects that have special application to the boy. They are good subjects well developed, and they ought to do much good. From the preface we learn that "the greater number of the addresses contained in this volume were delivered either in the boys' chapel or in St. Peter's Church, Stonyhurst, during the school year 1906-7. Some of them, however, are of earlier date

(1905-6). The volume is intended as a companion or sequel to those entitled, 'In the Morning of Life' and 'At the Parting of the Ways,' and it is hoped that, like its predecessors, it may prove useful to others besides schoolboys."

---

**THE SPRINGS OF HELICON.** A Study in the Progress of English Poetry From Chaucer to Milton. By *J. W. Mackail, M. A., LL. D.*, sometime fellow of Balliol College, professor of poetry in the University of Oxford. 12mo., pp. 204. Longmans, Green & Co., New York.

"The substance of this volume consists of lectures given from the chair of poetry at Oxford in the autumn terms of the years 1906 and 1908. They have been revised and slightly expanded for the purposes of publication. The volume is, as its title states, a study in the progress of English poetry. It forms one chapter in the subject with which the author proposed to deal during his tenure of the chair, that subject being the progress of poetry, or, in other words, the consideration of poetry as a progressive function and continuous interpretation of life."

The author calls the progress of our own poetry, between Chaucer and Milton, a single cycle, and confining himself to it, he deals with Chaucer, Spencer and Milton only in the present volume. The lectures or essays are very interesting and rather full.

---

**THE HOLY SACRIFICE AND ITS CEREMONIES.** An Explanation of Its Mystical and Liturgical Meaning. By *M. C. Nieuwborn, O. P., S. T. L.* Translated from the revised edition by *L. M. Bowman*. 12mo., pp. 111. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The author's purpose is "to increase men's love for the Holy Sacrifice by a better understanding of its mysteries; to reveal something of the unsearchable riches of Christ, of which St. Paul speaks (Eph. iii., 8), and to open out a new field to the mind, so that devotion of the heart may gather more abundant fruit, were it only in the souls of a few."

He does not attempt to treat the Mass in an exhaustive manner; it would be impossible in so small a space, but he gives a short, clear explanation of the different parts of the Holy Sacrifice in such a manner as to excite interest and beget devotion in the masses of the people.

---

**SERMONS ON MODERN SPIRITISM.** By *A. V. Miller, O. S. C.* 12mo., pp. xv.+178. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. St. Louis: B. Herder.

Six sermons on a subject of ever increasing interest. The author's purpose is to warn his hearers against the practice of



spiritism, and his discourses should have that effect. As to the truth or falsity of the claims of spiritists he is not so much concerned, because of the bad consequences of the cult which follow, whether these claims be false or true.

The author speaks of the different phenomena of spiritism, admits that by far the larger part of them can be accounted for by trickery or fraud, quotes reliable authorities for the smaller part, argues for possibility and sounds a warning.

---

**"AND THE WORD WAS MADE FLESH."** Short Meditations on the Fifteen Mysteries of the Rosary. By *Ephraim*. 12mo., pp. 148. London: St. Anselm Society.

The writer has taken each one of the mysteries in turn and devotes about eight or nine pages to it. He begins with the short invitation which is found in the rosary book before each mystery, and then develops the subject. For instance: The Annunciation. Let us contemplate in this mystery how the Angel Gabriel saluted Our Blessed Lady with the title "full of grace," and declared unto her the Incarnation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The meditations are very devotional as well as informing, and those who use them ought to draw additional fruit from the Rosary.

---

**THE WHITE SISTER.** By *F. Marion Crawford*. 12mo., pp. 335. New York: The Macmillan Company.

One of the two novels which Mr. Crawford left in manuscript when he died. An Italian story with a good deal of the tragic about it. Interesting, natural, almost true to life. We have never met a novelist or a dramatist who could write about priests or nuns with the correct atmosphere. We might almost say the same about artists. As soon as the novelist or the dramatist introduces a priest or a nun, or enters into a monastery or a convent, he becomes strained, artful, unnatural. It is practically impossible for a layman to describe the mind and heart of a nun. This is particularly true if he attempts to deal with the conflict between the natural and supernatural affections, and to go into an analysis of motives. These things are too subtle for the lay mind. The result is apt to be strained, stilted, sometimes offensive, and often ludicrous.

It is much praise of Mr. Crawford's story to say, that although his heroine is a nun, and his semi-heroine is a nun, and although a large part of the action of the story transpires in a hospital under the care of nuns, he has not offended seriously. We don't think that nuns would have acted as Mr. Crawford's did, under similar

circumstances, and we don't believe their spiritual directors would have allowed them to act that way. We are sure that we have never met nuns of that kind, and we have met a great many of various communities in a quarter of a century. While, then, we commend the story as a story, we cannot refrain from saying that we wish Mr. Crawford had not written it, and we hope that other secular novelists will not follow his example.

---

**A PRIVATE RETREAT FOR RELIGIOUS.** Enriched with reflections and select readings taken from the spiritual writings of St. Alphonsus. By *Rev. Peter Geiermann, C. SS. R.* 12mo., cloth. New York: Benziger Brothers.

In presenting this book to the public the author says: "There are many earnest souls working in the vineyard of the Lord, whose labors do not permit them to make the annual public retreat. Many others desire to spend a few days in solitude at the close of the year, or at some other time when their occupation will allow them to do so. There are still others, who, deriving more benefit from a private than a public retreat, prefer to make the spiritual exercises in total seclusion and silence. To all such this 'Private Retreat for Religious' is offered as an aid.

"In making the spiritual exercises, especially in private, some persons experience difficulty in employing the time profitably; others in digesting the truths of the spiritual life, and others again in acquiring the necessary knowledge of themselves. In this our 'Private Retreat' we have tried to remove these difficulties as far as possible, (1) by supplying abundant matter; (2) by working out the entire meditation as far as circumstances will permit; (3) by adding appropriate reading and examinations.

"As the meditations of most religious of our day last but a half hour, we have divided the meditations of this retreat into two parts, and added an appropriate reflection from St. Alphonsus for the benefit of those who may desire to prolong the exercise. Each point of the meditation is divided into 'Considerations and Applications' and 'Affections and Prayers;' the first aims at subjecting the mind, while the other is intended to conform the will to the mind and heart of God. The soul is further aided in acquiring the theory and practice of the spiritual life by daily spiritual reading and examinations and by a systematic interior examination, which will be introduced at the proper stage of the exercises.

"To facilitate the concentration of the mind on the work of the retreat, and to remove all unnecessary anxiety regarding its success, a special end is proposed for each day. By keeping this special end in view day after day the success of the retreat is, humanly speaking,



secured at every step; for the various exercises of the consecutive days not only harmonize with the general plan, but constitute its gradual development."

---

RULES OF LIFE FOR THE PASTOR OF SOULS. From the German by *Rev. Thomas Slater, S. J.*, and *Rev. A. Rauch, S. J.* 12mo., cloth. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This is an exceptionally good book of its kind. Beginning with chapters on Priestly Dignity, it deals with the questions of Holy Poverty, Rule of Life, Disposal of Time and Daily Routine. Then it takes up in turn the relations of the priest with others—his house-keeper, his curate, his neighbors, his flock—considering different classes, the civil authorities and persons of different faith. Each chapter is arranged as a colloquy between master and son, as in the "Imitation of Christ." The charm is in its briefness, its reasonableness and its practicability. All that is said is evidently true, and no offense is given in the saying.

---

LA BIENHEUREUSE MERE BARAT (1779-1865). Par *Geoffroy de Grandmaison*. Pp. viii.+206. Paris: V. Lecoffre.

This is a rare example of excellent biographical work in humble form. Few would guess the worth of the little paper book under the above title if he came across it on a book stand. And yet in so small a space the well-known and able author has succeeded in getting before his readers a full, true portrait of a great religious who lived on a stage and at a time when history was made very fast. Although she lived a retired life, as all holy souls must, her influence was far reaching and her power in moulding the minds of the young so striking throughout her long life, has been perpetuated in the members of the community of nuns which she founded, who are now scattered throughout the world.



70766

PERIODICAL

**DOES NOT CIRCULATE**

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE  
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM



